8135 b 2

# *PEACE* AND *REFORM*,

AGAINST

# WAR AND CORRUPTION.

IN

ANSWER TO A PAMPHLET,

WRITTEN

BY ARTHUR YOUNG, ESQ. ENTITLED,

"The EXAMPLE of FRANCE, A WARNING to BRITAIN."

written by Daniel Stuart
Secretary to The Friends of the People,

"*I shall always have the Satisfaction to have aimed sincerely*
"*at Truth and Usefulness, though in one of the meaneſt Ways.*"

LOCKE.

*LONDON:*

PRINTED FOR J. RIDGWAY, YORK STREET, ST. JAMES'S SQUARE.

MDCCXCIV.

47

10 9

84

# PEACE AND REFORM,

AGAINST

# WAR AND CORRUPTION.

AN attentive perusal of many political Pamphlets, produced in the beginning of the present year, and an opinion that it would not be difficult to expose the fallacy of the arguments upon which were founded the most popular of those written against the Cause of Freedom, led me first to think of attempting their refutation; and some leisure during the autumn months, enabled me to try what I had previously wished to have seen done by any abler hand. I have espoused that side which is, for the moment, the least popular; and obscure as both this Pamphlet and its Author may be, I am therefore prepared to expect some small share of that obloquy, which is now so largely bestowed on all those who presume to question the wisdom of the measures of government. Secured from danger by power, and uncontradicted by reason, because of the danger, the advocates of Corrup-

tion have of late exulted, almoſt unoppoſed, in their triumph. The moſt moderate Favourers of Reform have been blended with the moſt inſane Zealots for Revolution; Toleration and Atheiſm; Peace and Regicide, have, by the ſupporters of abuſes, been wickedly deemed, and by the multitude weakly believed, to be ſynonimous terms.

The national underſtanding thus miſled and prejudiced; the temper of a very great majority of the People rendered furious and vindictive; the partizans and the partakers of Corruption bold, active, and cruel; the current has been, from neceſſity, ſuffered of late to run wholly in favour of the moſt abſolute Toryiſm. Few men would enter on a labour ſo perilous and unacceptable as that of expoſing the Deluſion. To incur odium from the many for the approbation of the already approving few; to write cramped up as much as if pinioned in the Pillory, leſt it ſhould actually be the reward; to oppoſe reaſon to paſſion, and be certain of being unſucceſsful, whether right or wrong, were conſiderations ſufficient to intimidate Prudence by the danger of the attempt, and by its hopeleſsneſs, even to ſilence the moſt honeſt Zeal in the cauſe of Freedom.

Accordingly the Preſs laſt winter was much more occupied by Tory or High Church and King opinions, than two years before it had been by thoſe of an oppoſite deſcription. Their abundance was even greater than the harveſt which followed the labours of Mr. Burke; and although their arguments may be futile and ridiculous, they cannot fully be anſwered, while

New-

Newgate and the Pillory are called in to ſupport them.

The firſt Pamphlet that ſuggeſted to me the idea of endeavouring to expoſe theſe exploded, inconſiſtent, miſchievous, Doctrines, was, that of Mr. Arthur Young. Several reaſons induced me to think it a proper object of animadverſion; for, although on the firſt peruſal it appeared to be ſuch a jumble of contradictions, falſehoods, and even libels on that Conſtitution which it profeſſed to defend, that I did not believe common ſenſe could endure it; yet on reading the approbation of Mr. Reeves, and finding it had been circulated with great induſtry, I concluded it might be of ſome uſe to refute what I thought ſo ſuſceptible of refutation; and while the apparent eaſineſs of the taſk ſeemed to ſet its accompliſhment within my reach, an object ſo inglorious did not promiſe to provoke a Rival. Mr. Reeves has, by his approbation, adopted its opinions as his own, and, however worthleſs it may be in itſelf, it no doubt derives ſome conſequence from being thus promulgated as the Manifeſto of his Committee.

Its deſign is to deter us from making a Parliamentary Reform, by exciting our horror at the atrocities which have taken place in France; theſe atrocities Mr. Young falſely aſcribes to the principles of Liberty; and aſſerts, that Engliſhmen would be equally guilty with their neighbours, if once they began political improvement. With *Reform* he connects *Property*; and attempts to eſtabliſh as a fact, that a government more purely repreſentative than our own is at preſent, could not long exiſt without an Agrarian Law;

thus, deceitfully alarming all men of wealth and adviſing them to join in the war againſt the French, as the only means of preſerving whatever they hold dear. To follow him regularly through every falſehood and abſurdity would neither be entertaining nor uſeful. I ſhall therefore begin with ſome ſpecimens of his unfairneſs: I ſhall ſhew that the crimes of France, ſo far from having any natural connection with her principles, are the very ſame which the rage of Faction has led the Friends of War and Corruption in England, if not to perpetrate, at leaſt to recommend in ſupport of Principles directly oppoſite; and which, if admitted to be proof againſt the principles of French Liberty, muſt alſo be proof againſt the principles of Mr. Young, and the other Engliſh Tories, as the blind advocates of each ſyſtem equally applaud them. After having diſcuſſed theſe preliminary matters, I ſhall proceed to the conſideration of the two great queſtions of Reform and Peace, againſt which Mr. Young and his fellow labourers have raiſed ſo many prejudices.

His diſingenuouſneſs is evident at the commencement of his book, the very foundation of which is laid on palpable miſrepreſentation. He owns himſelf to have been a "warm friend" to the firſt Revolution, yet the chief part of his induſtry is employed in condemning Mr. Paine, Major Cartwright, &c. for their writings in defence of it. He reprobates them for having done what he himſelf did, yet he does not own he did wrong. Had he like others repented his miſtake and made his recantation, he then, with a better grace, might have attacked thoſe with whom

whom he formerly had agreed; and, like Mr. Pitt in the laſt debate on Parliamentary Reform, might have maintained, that conſiſtency was a proof of a want of judgment, and that it was always to be preſumed thoſe were in an error who did not change their opinion.

" The Revolution before the 10th of Au-
" guſt" (ſays Mr. Young), " was as different
" from the Revolution after that day as light
" from darkneſs; as clearly diſtinct in prin-
" ciple and practice as Liberty and Slavery.
" The ſame principles which directed me to
" approve the Revolution in its commence-
" ment, the principles of *real Liberty*, led me
" to deteſt it after the 10th of Auguſt." Here he aſſerts his approbation of the Revolution *up to* the 10th of Auguſt, which he acknowledges was conducted, till that period, on the principles of *real Liberty*; and he alſo ſays in the ſame page, " How little reaſon therefore
" to reproach me with ſentiments *contrary* to
" thoſe I publiſhed before the 10th of Auguſt;—
" I am *not* changeable, but ſteady and con-
" ſiſtent."

Compare this with page 21, where, in ſpeaking of the Revolution, he affirms, " it has
" brought more miſery, poverty, devaſtation,
" impriſonment, bloodſhed and ruin, on France,
" in *four years*, than the old government
" did in a century."—If the " *principles* and
" *practice* of the Revolution up to the 10th of
" Auguſt were conformable with real liberty,"
how could they have brought miſery, poverty, &c. on France for *four years?* How comes it that he approves the devaſtation, bloodſhed,

and

and ruin *before* the 10th of Auguſt and yet diſapproves of them afterwards ?—But it is in fact the old Deſpotiſm he contends for, which (p. 33) he calls " the mildeſt and moſt benignant go-" vernment in Europe, our own only excepted; " a government cruelly libelled in the cha-" racter given by one of our reforming " Orators."—Mr. Young, however, libels it ſtill more in his own Travels, publiſhed long after the Revolution, where, ſpeaking of the natural richneſs of the country, he ſays " the diſpenſa-" tions of Providence ſeem to have permitted " the human race to exiſt only as the prey of " Tyrants, as it has made pidgeons for the prey " of hawks."—" Oh ! if I were a legiſlator of " France, I would make ſuch great lords ſkip " again !"—Yet this is the government which he now calls " regular and mild." *—I would not quote theſe paſſages, if Mr. Young had owned his approbation of the firſt Revolution had been miſplaced : But, on the contrary, he affirms he is " ſteady and conſiſtent."

Mr. Paine's works he treats as if they had been written and publiſhed ſince the 10th of Auguſt, 1792. The panegyrics contained in " The Rights of Man" on the Conſtitution of 1789,—A conſtitution of which Mr. Young declares his unaltered approbation, are falſely and artfully tortured into panegyrics on the Convention, and the events that have taken place ſince the deſtruction of monarchy. For inſtance, he gives part of a ſpeech of Marat in January 1793, wherein the Convention is called

* P. 49.

" a ſcandalous

" a ſcandalous ſpectacle—an aſſembly of mad-
" men and furies," and immediately follows it by obſerving, that " Paine is of a contrary " opinion, he ſaid they debate in the language " of gentlemen; their dignity is ſerene, &c." Theſe paſſages in Paine were publiſhed long before the 10th of Auguſt; and with equal juſtice might the eulogiums of Mr. Burke, on the character of the French people, prior to 1789, be quoted as eulogiums on the maſſacres of the ſecond of September.

But Mr. Young's reaſonings are not more inconſiſtent with the opinions he pretends to entertain, than they are with each other, for " The example of France, a warning to Britain" may not improperly be called " the example " of France an example to Britain." It reproaches the French with deſtroying the Liberty of the Preſs, and adviſes the very ſame thing to be done in England; it condemns the principle of arming one claſs of men againſt another, and ſoon afterwards ſets forth the neceſſity of following the example here, by arming the rich againſt the poor; and the violation of the freedom of election at Paris is held up to deriſion, while corruption and preſcriptive election in England are applauded as the true foundation of national proſperity. Indeed he is not ſingular in theſe blunders, for bloodſhed and rapine would be equally practiſed in this country as in France, if we may take the *will* for the *deed*. Here the theory has been inſtilled and admired; there the practice has been adopted. And the only difference between the French and Engliſh Marats,—a difference which does

does not diminiſh their guilt,—is, that the one would aſſaſſinate all who deny, and the other would aſſaſſinate all who maintain the ſovereignty of the people.

The faults of the Convention, of public bodies, and even of individuals, are carefully collected and detailed as the deliberate acts not only of thoſe who rule in France, but of the whole nation. The moſt falſe aſſertion or the moſt wicked counſel, though coming from an inſignificant fool, or diſregarded madman, is ſufficient to excite Mr. Young's execration, and to criminate a whole people. How little leſs guilty can the reaſonable part of mankind think this kingdom, if their judgment is formed in the ſame manner. Crimes equally deteſtable have been preached and vindicated in this country, by perſons of eminent ſtation; and if the ſanguinary ſcenes of Paris have not been repeated in London, Mancheſter, and Birmingham, it is not for the want of Britiſh Marats, and Roberſpierre's to inſtigate and protect the inſtruments. If aſſaſſination is to be committed, it is indifferent to me who are the objects, or what are the motives;—whether the victim be a plunderer of the poor induſtrious Swiniſh Multitude, or of pampered tyrannical Nobles, and lazy miſchievous Prieſts. The offence is as heinous in the one caſe as in the other; and juſtice might be as much violated, were Marat or Roberſpierre, as if Windham or Burke were to be murdered with impunity.

As a companion to Mr. Young's ſhocking picture of France, I ſhall give the outline of a propoſed one in England. But if my colouring

is not ſo bold as his, it muſt be accounted for by the peculiar circumſtances under which I write, rather than in the weakneſs of my ſubject. What he ſays of Chabot, Roberſpierre, or Danton, it may be dangerous to ſay of a prieſt, a counſellor, or a judge in England. He might decorate his tales with the moſt glaring falſehood and rancorous calumny, and be in uniſon with the nation and in favour with the government. The diſapprobation of the firſt, and reſentment of the ſecond, might be my lot, were I to indulge equally in much better grounded invective. His reaſoning is enforced by aids which it would be imprudent, probably dangerous, for me to uſe; for when it is difficult to demonſtrate his argument, or ſuſtain his aſſertion, he attacks humanity with a pike, a dagger, or a guillotine, and, addreſſing himſelf to the feelings, inſtead of the underſtanding, triumphantly exults in his abſurdity and falſehood.

If "Marat's grand ſpecific of cutting off "* 150,000 heads" be compared with Mr. Reeves's "exceſs of virtue to exterminate the "Diſſenters,†" which ſhall, we think, moſt criminal? There are more than 150,000 diſſenting heads in Britain, therefore Mr. Reeves outdoes Marat; but, on the other hand, we muſt recollect that he does it in a more delicate manner. Marat ſpoke roundly out; Mr. Reeves only *inſinuates*. Marat's, however, were words,

* Young p. 69.

† Vide the *original* publication of Thomas Bull to John Bull, owned and apologized for by Mr. Reeves; and alſo the Comments of Mr. Fox in his Speech, Dec. 13, 1792.

and might have been the ebullition of the moment, but Mr. Reeves's was a deliberate act, which, from its nature, muſt have been conſidered and approved by a body of men, the Crown and Anchor Committee. In whatever way we compare theſe two circumſtances, we ſhall find them nearly on a par; but their effects in this country were very different. Marat's advice has been the theme of horror in every company, though it did not extend to them; on the contrary, Mr. Reeves's has been little noticed, though there are very few perſons who have not ſome friends among the diſſenters, and conſequently were affected by it. The more we examine the characters of theſe two gentlemen, the greater ſimilarity we ſhall find between them. How far they have been juſtly rewarded, I ſhall not pretend to decide: Mr. Reeves, beſides enjoying about half a dozen places under government, has lately been paid between three and four thouſand pounds—Marat has been aſſaſſinated.

Mr. Reeves, in his "reflections on the preſent criſis," ſays, "it would be well if thoſe "who diſlike the Engliſh Conſtitution would "remove to another region." What decree of the Convention would occaſion emigration more certainly than this ſentiment, if it had the power? And Judge Aſhhurſt, in his charge to the grand jury on the 19th of November, 1792, at the very moment the decree of fraternity was paſſing in France, declared, "there "have, however, under the beſt ſyſtems of go-"vernment, been found men of corrupt prin-"ciples, who, having forſaken honeſt induſtry,

wiſh

" wiſh to throw every thing into confuſion, and " to live by rapine and plunder; when that is " the caſe, it is become neceſſary for the coer- " cive power of the ſtate to lend its reſtrain- " ing hand, and to puniſh offences of ſuch a " flagrant nature. There is no proſpect of " reformation, till ſuch *corrupt members* be " *cut off* *." The wide ſenſe which would be given to the laſt expreſſion by the inflamed populace, among whom this charge was liberally diſtributed, it is not very difficult to imagine.

The Faſt Day, inſtead of being paſſed in conformity with its profeſſed purpoſe, in humiliation before God, in prayers for the converſion of unbelievers, the reformation of ourſelves, and the general peace and happineſs of mankind; inſtead of a day on which every prieſt made an extraordinary exertion of his powers in imploring the benevolence of the Almighty to enlighten the minds, to ſoften the hearts, and to ſpare the blood of his people, it was chiefly celebrated by the moſt dreadful maledictions. The Supreme Being, who, true religion tells us, enjoins brotherly love, forgiveneſs, humanity and virtue, was addreſſed by our divines as if he had been more mercileſs and blood-thirſty than any divinity that ever diſgraced paganiſm; and the temples of the God of Peace were made to reſound with imprecations, from which even our anceſtors would have recoiled when engaged in the worſhip of their ferocious Odin, whom they revered as " the terrible and ſevere God; the active " roaring deity; the father of ſlaughter; the

* Vide the miniſterial Gazette, the Times of November 30th, always very correct in its law reports.

" God that carrieth deſolation and fire, and " nameth thoſe that are to be ſlain *."

The ſolemnity of the ſcene was well calculated for rouſing and miſleading the paſſions, and every artifice was employed to excite hatred towards the French, and provoke us to fury. The prieſthood as well as the princes felt themſelves intereſted in the cauſe, and their zeal ſhook the pulpit with exhortations to vengeance. The Biſhop of Glouceſter, before the Houſe of Lords, thus ſpoke of that nation;—" Infatuated and " remorſeleſs people! The meaſure of your " iniquities ſeems at length to be full; the hour " of retribution is coming faſt upon you! Drunk " with the blood of your fellow citizens, you " have dared to ſpread your ravages abroad; " rouſing the ſurrounding nations, in juſtice to " themſelves and the common cauſe of hu- " manity, to confederate againſt you, *in order* " *to execute the wrath of God on your devoted* " *heads.*" His lordſhip, however, might have been reſtrained from ſuch raſh denunciations of divine judgment, by the awful admonitions of the founder of that religion which he pretended to preach."

" And Jeſus anſwering, ſaid, ſuppoſe ye theſe " Galileans were ſinners above all the Galileans, " becauſe they ſuffered ſuch things? I tell you " nay,—But except ye repent, ye ſhall all like- " wiſe periſh."

" And thoſe eighteen on whom the Tower of " Siloam fell and ſlew them, think ye that they " were ſinners above all men that dwelt in Je-

* See the Edda.

" ruſalem?

" ruſalem? I tell you nay: but except ye re-
" pent, ye ſhall all likewiſe periſh*."

The other Faſt Day Sermons were in uniſon with that of the biſhop of Glouceſter, with a very few exceptions. The Rev. J. Gardener, at Taunton, ſaid, " Shall we not labour to " bring ſuch perſons" (as the French, and Reformers in general) " to a proper ſenſe of their " duty, *or exterminate them and their opi-* " *nions?*" and the Rev Mr. Bromeley, at Fitzroy Chapel, hopes " that the reckoning which God " will make will not be long delayed againſt a " nation," (France) " which is certainly be-" hind no other whoſe meaſure of iniquities " has in any records of time *called forth his* " *vengeance to eraſe it from the earth* †." Theſe are the ſentiments of our high church paſtors: Such is the religion, the benevolence, the humanity, they teach! To exterminate for opinion! What more did Marat ever deſire! To be the inſtrument of God in executing his vengeance, Mahomet uſed the ſame plea for all his murders and rapine! To eraſe a whole nation from the earth!!! Neither Mahomet, Marat, nor Roberſpierre, have equalled this! How limited and inſignificant have been their proſcriptions compared with thoſe of our own pious paſtors, who would " ſeal on the fore-" head as the ſervants of God ‡," all thoſe who make war againſt France; who would " ſend

* St. Luke, c. xiii.

† Theſe paſſages are taken from the ſermons publiſhed under the names of thoſe divines.

‡ Vide Revelations, c. vii. v. 3.

" myriads

" myriads of locuſts, with crowns like gold upon " their heads, and faces like men, inveſted with " ſcorpion power, to torture the unſealed" enthuſiaſts of that diſtracted nation, and " let " looſe the angels of the Euphrates to ſlaughter " a third of mankind * !"

Similar paſſages from the ſermons preached on that *Chriſtian* day would fill a volume. Moſt of them tend to inflame the people to a war of extermination, and inſinuate the deſtruction of thoſe who deſire a Parliamentary Reform. Surely our divines cannot be ſo much miſtaken as to imagine theſe harangues gratifying to the Head of the Church? Their affection towards the crown, indeed, is natural. The Biſhop of Durham's promotion has taught them the road to preferment; and my Lord of Glouceſter has been long looking for a tranſlation: but not ſuch as Elijah's: His preſent ambition looks no higher than Canterbury.

Nor were the ſermons publicly preached more inflammatory than the writings anonimouſly publiſhed by our High-Church Men; one of which, in Birmingham, under the fictitious name of Job Nott, thus ſpeaks of thoſe whom he calls " New-faſhioned, reſtleſs " Diſſenters," and the members of a ſociety inſtituted on the principles of Mr. Pitt and the Duke of Richmond for procuring a Reform of Parliament. " Do be off—only think of the " New Drop—you may be recorded in the " Newgate Calendar—tranſportation may re- " form you—*you deſerve to be highly exalted*—

* Vide Reve'ations, c. ix.

" Did

" Did you ever ſee the New Drop?" and concludes with wiſhing that theſe Diſſenters and Reformers, whom he deems factious, " tied in " their garters may ſwing." Yet this elegant author calls himſelf a friend to conciliation and unanimity, a *moderate* man, a man of *peace!* He may be ſo for a *Birmingham* man; but if ſuch are the friends to peace and moderation in that town, can we wonder at the atrocities which have taken place there, and ſtill may be repeated, while Job Nott and ſuch publications are publicly ſold with a bookſeller's name to them, and are even boaſted of by their authors*?

Members of both Houſes of Parliament have acted in uniſon with the church, and have alſo repeatedly inſiſted that a war of extermination is the only thing which can ſave this country. The defence of the riot at Manchester equals the exhortations of the pulpit. We not only find riots indirectly recommended, but openly vindicated. Unlawful violence againſt a man for his political opinions is juſtified in the Britiſh Houſe of Commons! Here the " Sacred duty of inſurrection" is preached as unequivocally as ever it was in France, where actual and exceſſive danger is in ſome degree a palliation of criminality. But in England no juſtification of ſimilar atrocities could be ſhewn, except in the unfounded apprehenſions artfully excited by a falſe and pernicious alarm.

* One very curious article contained in Job Nott, deſigned probably to give confidence to the Church and King Partizans, is, " that Sir Robert Lawley never is kept wait- " ing by Mr. Pitt, *when* he ſends in word it is on *Bir-* " *mingham buſineſs.*"

Mr.

Mr. Reeves's Committee detected in their outſet, inſinuating it to be an exceſs of virtue to exterminate the Diſſenters, did not alter their courſe, though they more carefully concealed their proceedings. The ſtreets were over-run with the moſt violent inflammatory libels; the war-whoop againſt Diſſenters and Reformers was ſung at every corner; and, if aſſaſſination was not committed, it was not for want of prompters. Some of the hand-bills and ballads in circulation laſt winter would even have ſhocked Mr. Burke! And it is fortunate that the lower had more diſcretion and humanity than the higher ranks of perſons who encouraged ſuch publications, otherwiſe we might have had a Tory *Second* of *September* in England; and the bloody anniverſary, a diſtinguiſhed *red* letter day in the "Church and King" Calendar, might have been celebrated by our Bigots.

Not one of the authors or diſtributors of thoſe incendiary papers was even ſeized, much leſs puniſhed: but a poor bill-ſticker, who could not read, was tried and impriſoned for poſting up bills in favour of Parliamentary Reform; and Holt, the printer, at Newark, has been convicted of a libel for re-printing a paper on the ſame ſubject, which was firſt circulated under the auſpices of Mr. Pitt and the Duke of Richmond, when they contended for that meaſure; and which it is not improbable was originally written by his Grace, as it ſtrongly contends for Univerſal Repreſentation.

I ſhall not comment on what Mr. Young repeatedly inſinuates, though he does not plainly deſire,

deſire, by ſuch paſſages as " The King of " France died on the ſcaffold, becauſe he would " not ſhed the blood of Traitors, Conſpirators " and Rebels; he liſtened to thoſe who peti- " tioned for Reform;" and I ſhall alſo paſs over the many oral threats of aſſaſſination made by individuals, the anonymous letters to the ſame effect, one of which at Staines, threatened the houſe and life of Mr. Fox, and conclude this ſlight ſketch, of the deſire of ſome men, to ſee " Church and King" maſſacres in this country, by giving as an epitome of the others, an extract from a hand-bill, circulated at Exeter, in December laſt. " Our noble King hath made a " fine ſpeech from the throne to his Parliament, " as muſt be acknowledged by every well-wiſher " to his country, and as for them that do not " like that and the preſent CONSTITUTION, let " them have their deſerts, that is a HALTER " and a GIBBET, and be burnt afterwards, not " as PAINE hath been, in effigy, but in body " and perſon. To which every loyal heart will " ſay Amen!"

Theſe facts, I think, are ſufficient to juſtify me in aſſerting, that the aſſaſſinations, and other crimes in France, are not deteſted by certain perſons in this country on account of their enormity, but that thoſe who execrate moſt bitterly, only wiſh to imitate them on a different claſs of victims. Marat's fall was regretted, by our Tories, becauſe he laid the eggs of miſchief; and the death of the King of France, was declared in the Houſe of Commons, by a member of Adminiſtration, to be, in ſome reſpects, a fortunate

circumſtance in rouſing the Britiſh Nation to War.

The animating ſoul of Mr. Young's book, being the atrocities of the French, which he falſely aſcribes to their principles, I have thought it neceſſary at my commencement to ſhew, that, according to his own reaſoning, he condemns his own principles, ſince the ſame atrocities have been recommended by the advocates for his opinions; and, that if I might indulge in the ſame furious execration, I could find cruel doctrines enough in England to balance againſt him:—to miſlead and inflame thoſe who ſwallow aſſertion for fact, and invective for argument. I do not, however, defend the crimes of the French, although I think, as far as crimes can be excuſed, no people in the world ever had more to plead in extenuation, becauſe no people in the world ever were ſo irritated by internal treachery, and alarmed by external danger.

But, proſcription and cruelty, are not the only parts of the conduct of the French which have been imitated in this country. We had our Tory Jacobin Aſſociators at the St. Alban's Tavern, and our more furious and degraded Club of Cordeliers in the Crown and Anchor Committee. If in Paris "Perſons have been impriſoned by order of individuals," others, at home, have been voted in a ſtate of accuſation, upon the authority of anonymous letters tranſmitted to Mr. Reeves. The affiliated Jacobin Clubs of the French Provinces have been made the model of the Reeveſian Aſſociations and Committees againſt Republicans and Levellers at home; and in the

Engliſh

Engliſh Parochial, as well as in the French Popular Meetings, the Conſtitution, as declared by Reeves, Pitt, and Co. has been formally approved. Every Preſident or Chairman of theſe Conventions becomes a Municipal Inquiſitor: Sir Joſeph Banks makes his *viſites domiciliaires* in the pariſh of St. Anne, and keeps a regiſter of the complexion, age, employment, &c. of lodgers and ſtrangers. The ſection of St. James's *denounce* for *inciviſm* every houſe-keeper who does not oblige his ſervants, workmen, and apprentices, to ſign their acceptance of the Conſtitution. No tradeſmen is to be employed, who has not been fraternized by the officers of his diſtrict; no publican is to be licenſed, who has not reported *ſuſpected perſons*. Every man is called upon, more palpably than in France, to declare our Conſtitution glorious and unreformable; and if any one is more conſiſtent than Mr. Pitt and the Duke of Richmond, and ſignifies a wiſh for the removal of abuſes in the conſtruction of the Houſe of Commons, he is branded as a Jacobin, and if poſſible, utterly ruined. Is not this governing by the very ſame means, ſo much execrated in the French: by mobs, by terror, by popular coercion? The great maſs of the people, from the higheſt to the loweſt ranks, are ſummoned to conſtitute themſelves into partial arbitrary tribunals to acquit and to condemn.

The dread and regret with which the inſtitution of theſe Engliſh Primary Aſſemblies was beheld by the rational Friends of Freedom, found ſome conſolation in the hope that they would not be of long duration. It was imagined when

the temporary alarm was paſt, that they would not only be diſuſed, but the public would contemn the deluſion, and give the government of the country to thoſe who conſtitutionally ſhould poſſeſs it, and whoſe reſponſibility is a check upon their intemperance, the King's Miniſters. But inſtead of this, we find our Tory affiliated Societies, converted into the inſtruments of the Church and King Jacobins, and executing without authority or reſponſibility, thoſe meaſures which adminiſtration deſire, but cannot with decency tranſact. They denounce all who wiſh to petition the King or Parliament, contrary to the ſentiments of the Placemen and Penſioners at the Crown and Anchor Tavern; the inhabitants of Glaſgow have been threatened with Church and King vengeance for preſuming to complain of that which is daily ruining them,—the War; and our Parochial Clubs are knocking down the Conſtitution, in imitation of the Clubs in France, by voting contributions to ſupport the army. Every perſon may ſoon be obliged, under pain of denunciation as a traiterous Jacobin, to join in theſe patriotic gifts; and by ſuch proceedings, the neceſſity of calling Parliament together, may be ultimately ſuperſeded. Such an alteration in the Conſtitution would, no doubt, be highly agreeable to the Alarmiſts.

To condemn opinions or inſtitutions for crimes which are committed by their real or pretended ſupporters, is both groſs fallacy, and flagrant injuſtice. The moſt clear principles, and the moſt ſalutary inſtitutions, are open to the attack of ſuch ſophiſtry. Suppoſe I were inclined to condemn the Britiſh Government in Church and

State

State, becauſe the riots and exceſſes in Birmingham were in behalf of Church and King, would any man of ſenſe admit ſuch events as full proof that our Conſtitution is fundamentally vicious? Yet, if I were to argue thus, I would only imitate Mr. Young. I might like him ſay, "the "*theory* of the Engliſh religion is *peace*, but the "*practice* is *riot*;—the preachers of it, tell us "to have good will towards our neighbours, yet "they inſtigate a mob to fire and plunder them. "As for their kingly government it is ſtill worſe. "The people pay about twenty millions an-"nually for *protection*, but at Birmingham the "rabble are permitted to *burn* and *rob* for a "week together; and if it ſo happens that "they have deſtroyed your whole property; "and you have not a long purſe to go to law, "you can have no redreſs:—If you are com-"pletely ruined, you are completely excluded "from juſtice.—Such is the Britiſh Govern-"ment—Such is their glorious Conſtitution!— "But in preference to it give me the ſimple "deſpotiſm of Pruſſia: At Spandau I may go "to ſleep in ſafety:—at Birmingham I may ex-"pect to be awakened amidſt the flames of "their helliſh Church and King Government."

In 1780, Mr. Young might ſtill have condemned the proteſtant religion—not more juſtly—but more ſpeciouſly. If he had written on the 6th of June, in that year, he might, with the ſame fairneſs with which he treats the French, have ſaid, "The proteſtant religion is "a bayonet in your breaſt, or a bullet in your "boſom. In *theory* it teaches to do unto others "as you would have them do unto you; in

"*practice*,

" *practice*, it teaches fire, plunder, devaſta-
" tion and bloodſhed. The Proteſtants *entreat*
" redreſs *by petition*, and aſſault, wound, and
" threaten thoſe who are to grant it: They
" pray for their enemies, and burn the houſes
" and chapels of thoſe who do not offend them:
" They declaim againſt drunkenneſs, and get
" ſo beaſtly drunk that they are conſumed in
" the diabolical flames of their own kindling:
" they recommend honeſty and mercy, yet
" empty the goals of felons and murderers
" whom they make their aſſociates. Their
" *theory* inſtils *virtue*, but their practice ap-
" proves only of *vice*. They enlighten mankind
" by a general conflagration, and ſend ſouls to
" heaven by bludgeon and halter worſhip. Such
" is the proteſtant religion! Give me paganiſm.
" Among the Tartars I may ſit in ſafety under
" my own fig-tree. No ſanguinary rapacious
" proteſtant, with the creed in one hand and a
" bludgeon in the other, will, in Thibet, de-
" mand money at my door and threaten to burn
" my houſe: THERE I WOULD BE IN SAFETY."

In this manner Mr. Young might condemn the Britiſh government and religion, by blaming them for the crimes committed in popular commotions, which the beſt of governments cannot always prevent; and from theſe as reaſonably draw concluſions unfavourable to them, as he has done to the French Revolution, by applying the crimes of individuals, or the temporary accidental confuſion and miſchief in France, to the principles which actuate the maſs of the people.

Our Alarmiſts have not only adopted the French ſyſtem of ruling by Clubs and Proſcriptions,

tions, but our own, and the other governments in Europe, have diſcovered much that is worthy of imitation in the conduct of the unanointed executive Council. If the French affiliated Brabant by the point of the ſword, have not the allies bullied, inſulted, dragooned every neutral power? Sweden, Denmark, Venice, Switzerland, Tuſcany, and Genoa, have had their independence violated. I dare not, indeed, ſpeak in adequate terms of the conduct purſued with the two latter powers, whoſe towns were threatened, with tolerable plainneſs, to be given up to military execution, if they did not declare War againſt France! Is there no reſemblance to be found between the decree of the 19th of November, and the conduct of our Generals and Admirals in the Weſt Indies and Toulon, where they have offered aſſiſtance and fraternity to all Frenchmen who would renounce obedience to the mother country, and accept of TRUE liberty, as modelled by thoſe who have juſt beſtowed it on Poland? The more the proceedings of the Belligerent Powers are examined, the more it will be found that France, which formerly ſet the faſhions of dreſs, now ſets the faſhions of government over Europe; and that the people of England in particular, have adopted their political conduct, with more eagerneſs, than ever they adopted the ſtile of a cap or a coat. The objects, indeed, are, different; but the means taken to obtain or ſecure thoſe objects, and which alone excite indignation, are the *very ſame*:—Nay, the objects of the French people, the eſtabliſhment of the Liberties, the Peace, and the Happineſs of Mankind, are *good*, admitting the means to be bad: But

the

the objects of the Tory Jacobins, perpetuating the ignorance of the poor, arming the rich againſt the poor, the ſuppreſſion of the Freedom of Speech, and the Liberty of the Preſs, together with the juſtification of every vice of government, are *bad*, and their means are *equally bad* alſo.

It will be found, upon a candid examination of facts, that inſtead of the crimes which have diſgraced France, being the conſequence of her principles, they have been produced and wilfully inſtigated by the German Princes, in hopes of rendering odious thoſe very principles, as they dreaded that their eſtabliſhment in France, would ultimately deſtroy all tyrannical governments in Europe. The French were by no means the authors of the preſent War; on the contrary, they did all in their power to prevent it. It was the Courts of Auſtria and Berlin, and a few profligate emigrants, that provoked the rupture, which has now involved Europe in calamity. France confined herſelf within her own territories, and to her own domeſtic concerns, till ſhe was exaſperated by a combination againſt a government recently ſettled, approved by her inhabitants, and which promiſed to eſtabliſh a peaceable and laſting limited monarchy. Before the ferment of the firſt Revolution was allayed, and the dregs it had ſtirred up were ſunk to their proper obſcurity, the King, by his flight, proved his connection with the Princes who were plotting againſt the Conſtitution. Their hoſtile intrigues at foreign courts, became too manifeſt and provoking: they deſerted their country to procure its invaſion, and

left

left the field compleatly in poſſeſſion of the Republican party, whoſe credit they ſtrenghtened by their own treachery, and taught the people to believe the Nobles naturally and irrevocably their enemies; and to conclude, that ſecurity for their Liberties was to be looked for, in their own interference and activity, rather than in the generoſity or juſtice of the higher ranks of ſociety.

In September 1791, the manifeſto from Monſieur and the Comte d'Artois to the King of France, announced their ſucceſs in perſuading the Emperor and the King of Pruſſia to hoſtilty againſt the new Conſtitution: and thoſe Monarchs gave it under their hands, ſigned at Pilnitz, that they required all the powers in Europe to aſſiſt them in this War, for "the Rights "of Sovereigns." The Princes alſo affirmed, that "the *other* European Courts had the ſame "diſpoſitions with thoſe of Vienna and Ber-"lin."—The ſpeedy confirmation of what they had aſſerted, reſpecting the Emperor and King of Pruſſia, procured belief to the other paſſages of their declaration, particularly as they remained uncontradicted by thoſe to whom they made alluſion; and it was neceſſarily concluded, that all courts, and even that of St. James's, wiſhed well to the concert of Princes. But how did France act in this ſituation?—Not like England laſt winter. She did not precipitate herſelf into a War, although provoked by the moſt flagrant violation of the Rights of Nations. She negociated;—for eight months ſhe negociated:—till finding it impoſſible to obtain

either ſatisfaction or explanation for the Pilnitz Conſpiracy, and that the Deſpots of Germany were reſolved on hoſtilities, and were only delaying their commencement till fully prepared, ſhe ſubmitted to inevitable compulſion; and to ſhew that ſhe was not diſmayed or terrified, ſhe proclaimed War, which on her part was indiſputably *defenſive by anticipation*. But notwithſtanding hoſtilities had been effectually declared by the Emperor and King of Pruſſia, in Auguſt 1791, and ſhe did not reſolve on a rupture till the April following, many perſons have had the effrontery and folly to aſſert, that France invited the War!

It is neither to their new principles, nor the natural cruelty of the French, that we are to aſcribe the atrocities which have lately diſgraced that nation. It might as well be ſaid, that the principles of the Proteſtant Religion inculcate murder and rapine, becauſe ſuch doctrines have lately been recommended from the pulpit; or that they produced the riots in 1780, as that the Principles of Liberty which have animated the French are the cauſe of the crimes committed by ſome of them. It is to the foreign combination againſt the people, and the reſiſtance of the rich to the eſtabliſhment of their Liberties at home;—"It was that hateful out-
"rage on the rights and feelings of human
"nature, that wretched tiſſue of pride, folly,
"and inhumanity; it was the Duke of Brunſ-
"wick's Manifeſto that firſt ſteeled the heart and
"maddened the brain of all France; which pro-
"voked thoſe it had devoted, to practice all
"the

" the cruelties it had impotently threatened to
" inflict; which ſharpened the daggers of the
" aſſaſſins of the 2d of September, and whetted
" the axe ſuſpended over the unfortunate Mo-
" narch *." That infamous manifeſto produced the 10th of Auguſt; the treacherous ſurrender of Longwy provoked the horrid maſſacres of the 2d of September; the inevitable War with Britain and Holland hurried the unfortunate Louis to the ſcaffold; and the loſs of Valenciennes proved the forerunner of the trial, and the delivery of Toulon the ſignal for the execution of the Queen. The ſucceſs of the combined powers has invariably occaſioned the very reverſe of their profeſſed object; it has always made more enthuſiaſts, united the people more firmly, and removed the proſpect of re-eſtabliſhing Monarchy and Nobility to a greater diſtance. Since all Europe has joined in the cry of eraſing France from the liſt of nations, ſhe has only retaliated by vowing the deſtruction of all Deſpotic Governments. The monſters of France have been begotten by the monſters of Germany. The Duke of Brunſwick firſt taught them proſcription and murder; their only choice was, whether they ſhould aſſaſſinate, or be aſſaſſinated;—whether the Duke of Brunſwick ſhould preſide over another St. Bartholomew, or Marat over a 2d of September.

We ſhuddered at the news of the 2d of September, yet the *merciful* doctrines preached at home, did not even excite a murmer. On the

* Vide Mr. Sheridan's Speech, Dec. 15, 1792.

Royal-Exchange the gallows was openly talked of, as neceſſary to extirpate the favourers of Peace and Reform. If then, Engliſhmen, by a falſe alarm, could be guilty of wiſhing for the blood of perſons whoſe only crime was difference of opinion, why ſhould we condemn the French, in whom every evil has been realized, which here was only dreaded? If Engliſhmen, merely becauſe they were *told* they were in danger, could endure ſuch ſanguinary language, what might not have been their acceſſes if ſome of the principal perſonages in the kingdom had brought an hundred thouſand German robbers to deſtroy our valued Conſtitution and eſtabliſh Deſpotiſm? If they had taken poſſeſſion of Yarmouth and Norwich, and threatened to give up the city of London to "military execu-"tion," what mad or wicked theoriſt might not then have been liſtened to? Mr. Young, by warning Britain againſt the example of France, does in fact acknowledge, that in ſimilar circumſtances, Engliſhmen would be guilty of ſimilar enormities. If they would not, what occaſion is there for *warning* them? The inhabitants of France are not naturally more cruel than thoſe of this country, and were the enemies of that nation to ceaſe to goad and exaſperate her by their forces without, and their treacherous and incendiary agents within, a fair experiment might then be made on the undiſturbed operation of French principles; it might then be ſeen, that from the forced ſtate in which France is held by the confederacy of Deſpots, ariſe thoſe crimes, and that impunity which have been falſely and wickedly aſcribed

to

to the Principles of Liberty. She might then, indeed, be an example, inſtead of a warning to other nations: and nobody foreſaw this more clearly than the Deſpots themſelves; for when the Conſtituent Aſſembly declared in favour of a pacific ſyſtem, againſt conqueſt or offenſive War, the whole fraternity on the continent were alarmed for their *trade*. Aboliſh War! Aboliſh the means of gratifying our ambition, of plundering our ſubjects and perpetuating our tyranny!—Aboliſh War!—Then we muſt make War on you to prevent it. We will give a ſtab to your pacific ſyſtem in its infancy, and by driving you into exceſſes and horrors, convince the world that War, our Trade, is neceſſary to the Happineſs of Society.

I cannot cloſe the whole ſubject of the War between France and the other continental powers better than by quoting what Lord Mornington ſaid in the Houſe of Commons, May 7, 1793, of the War in which England was engaged immediately after the revolution of 1688: his words may very juſtly be applied to the preſent conteſt, if inſtead of Louis XIV, we read the Triumvirate, the Empreſs of Ruſſia, the Emperor of Germany, and the King of Pruſſia. "The Wars which "immediately followed the Revolution," (ſaid his Lordſhip,) "were abſolutely neceſſary for the ſe- "curity of that auſpicious ſettlement. The re- "cent eſtabliſhment required protection, not "only againſt the abdicated King, and thoſe "who ſupported his cauſe at home, or who "had followed his fortunes abroad, but alſo "againſt the pride and jealouſy of Louis XIV. "*He could not ſuffer a LIMITED* MO-

"NARCHY,

" NARCHY, *FOUNDED* ON THE LIBERTIES " OF THE PEOPLE, to grow up and flouriſh *in* " *peace* ſo near his Throne. He naturally fore- " ſaw that ſuch a Conſtitution muſt become a " *continual reproach* to the tyranny of his go- " vernment, and an inſuparable obſtacle to the " progreſs of his ambition. It was, therefore, " his policy to attempt the deſtruction of ſo for- " midable a neighbour, by every means both of " open force, and *ſecret machination.*"

Next to the crimes committed in France, which have artfully been miſrepreſented as the conſequence of French Principles, the word *Equality* has been falſely deemed to mean an Agrarian Law: thus at once exciting horror, and creating an alarm for property. Mr. Reeves, in the publication already alluded to, ſays, Equality means, that all men ſhall be equally tall, equally wiſe, and equally ſtrong, as well as equally rich. This may be fit for Mr. Reeves to ſay, but not for me to anſwer. I do not doubt, however, of its having prejudiced the vulgar, who would naturally believe the French could be guilty of any thing, after being gravely told, that they had roaſted alive, baſted with oil, and eaten many of the Swiſs and Nobles; that others they had made into pies and cried them about the ſtreets*; and that they " were drunk " with the blood of their fellow citizens †." Mr. Young makes a better uſe, for the Tory Jacobins, of the word Equality, by conſtruing it to mean an equalization of property; " for,

* Vide the accounts of the tranſactions on the 10th of Auguſt, publiſhed ſoon after that day in the Times.

† Vid: Biſhop of Glouceſter's Sermon.

ſays

ſays he, " that all were equal in the eye of the " law, was decreed by the Conſtituent Aſſembly, " and why call the year 1792 the fourth of " Liberty and firſt of Equality?"—All were not equal in the eye of the law by the decree alluded to, or even previous to the 10th of Auguſt. One whole branche of the Legiſlature, the King, was above the law; and although I am ready to admit that it was childiſh to make the diſtinction in dating the year, yet, when I find ſome reaſon for it, and none in ſupport of Mr. Young's aſſertion, that " Property was glanced at," I think it is proper to take that reaſon, however ſmall, as the fair explanation, rather than put a conſtruction upon the word which no circumſtance juſtifies, merely becauſe Mr. Young aſſerts " it " either meant that (equalization of property) or " it meant nothing;" becauſe he acknowledges that he does not underſtand it, ſhall we receive as fact what he wiſhes, and for that reaſon ſuppoſes it to mean? The King was not amenable to the law, therefore, ſtrictly ſpeaking, there could not be perfect Equality. On the queſtion of Royal inviolability I give no opinion.

It is not neceſſary to ſay much in anſwer to the common miſrepreſentations of Equality. No candid intelligent man, either in France or England, could ever underſtand it to mean otherwiſe than an equality of reſponſibility to, and protection from the law; and of this, no nation in the world was ever more in want than France previous to the Revolution in 1789. The expence of law-ſuits conſtitutes the only grievous inequality in England. It is impoſſible for a poor man, with his own means, to obtain redreſs

dreſs by a courſe of law in this country* ; and, even a prudent man of ſmall fortune, will ſubmit to an injury, rather than riſk his ruin by entering into a conteſt with a wealthy litigious opponent. Many an inſtance of injuſtice, accompliſhed and maintained by riches, may be found in the Memoirs of a northern Nobleman, who has long been the tyrannical oppreſſor and plunderer of the poor, and middling claſſes, in that part of the kingdom, which is curſed with his reſidence.

It is to what *he calls* the French Equality, that Mr. Young aſcribes a ſyſtem of rapine and plunder, which he affirms exiſts in that nation. He concludes a number of his paragraphs with "This "is Equality! Rob the farmer! Plunder the "landholder and divide his land! Equality of "property! An Agrarian Law, &c. According "to French principles, the firſt beggar I meet, "may ſabre in one hand, rights of man in the "other, demand a ſhare of what is my own, "my property, my land at Bradfield." And in this manner he proceeds, arguing, as if an equalization of property had actually taken place

* It has been ſaid, even from the Bench, that our laws are equally open to the poor as to the rich, becauſe if a man cannot fee an advocate, the court will provide him one gratis. This, like ſome other parts of our Conſtitution, was excellently intended, and, no doubt, at its firſt inſtitution, proved highly beneficial; but like many more inſtitutions, Time, that great innovator, has reduced it to a mere ſhadow. The fee of a counſellor is the leaſt expence of a law-ſuit; nor can his ſervices be of much utility to his client, if he is unacquainted with his caſe, till after the trial has begun; and even then moſt probably, he cannot, from the ignorance of the poor man, rightly underſtand it.

in

in France; or at leaſt as if ſome notorious and undeniable proofs had occurred of robbing a man of his eſtate, and dividing it among "Beggars."

The only inſtance, however, which he attempts to produce in ſupport of this, (and if more or better could have been found, he has ſhewn ſo much induſtry in collecting the crimes of the French, that he certainly would have brought them forward), is, an unauthenticated one in the Clermonteſe, where an eſtate was ſeized from the proprietor, who was, no doubt, an emigrant, as Mr. Young owns, "*he lived at "a diſtance*"; and where ſome of the tenants who talked of retaining their farms, becauſe thoſe who laboured ſhould not pay money to thoſe who did nothing, were, moſt probably for ſo doing, obliged to quit, and the property was ultimately held in truſt for the nation. But this ſtory reſts wholly on Mr. Young's bare aſſertion, who has not quoted even the authority of a newſpaper, which he invariably does on all other occaſions; and whether it is true or falſe is immaterial, becauſe it proves nothing like a general principle of equalizing property. In the preſent ſtate of France, no doubt, many atrocious robberies are committed, which would be puniſhed or prevented, if the German Plunders would allow the government to act, as it certainly would do in tranquillity, with rigorous juſtice. In any country in a ſimilar ſituation, ſimilar crimes would be perpetrated; and at all events they can have no connection with the Principles of Liberty and Equality.—Becauſe the northern Lord to whom I have juſt

alluded, has, by dint of wealth, plundered every man in his neighbourhood who had any thing to loſe, are we therefore to conclude, that it is a principle in the Engliſh law that the rich may rob the poor?

Inſtances, and ſtrong authenticated inſtances, to confute Mr. Young's aſſertions reſpecting an Agrarian Law are on record, and cannot be denied. About the very time he was writing his book, when all the horrors and anarchy, on which he continually rings, were reigning, the Duc de Penthievre died, where he had long lived, in the heart of France. He poſſeſſed immenſe wealth both in land and moveables; was the father-in-law, but enemy, of the duke of Orleans, from whom his daughter had been long ſeparated; and he was even ſuppoſed to be unfriendly to the Revolution. He was an amiable and beloved man; he never interfered in politics; amidſt every violence and change, his property and perſon were untouched, and many a poor man's tear bedewed his grave. No beggar, ſabre in hand, demanded a ſhare of his property, either during his life or at his death. Here then, is a direct notorious proof, that the property even of an *eminent nobleman* is not violated, while he does not oppoſe the exiſting government; and undoubtedly every man, who conducted himſelf like the Duc de Penthievre, was equally unmoleſted. It was incumbent on Mr. Young to give proofs, that men had been plundered in France for no other offence than that of being rich, before he pretended to be ruled by "Events" which never took place, to be guided by "Experiments" which never

never were made, and to follow a "Practice" which never had any exiſtence, but in his own credulity or miſrepreſentation.

It is, however, highly probable, that the French Government, ſince it has no ally to pay the expences of defending its own territories, and is ſo hemmed in and inſulated by its enemies that it cannot borrow, will be obliged to have recourſe to ſome extraordinary meaſures which may be no further juſtifiable than on the hackneyed plea ſo often uſed by its preſent invaders, "State neceſſity!" But whatever may be done in the preſent ferment and alarm, when France, inſtead of thinking of ſtrict juſtice, has to ſtruggle for her very exiſtence as an independent nation, will be no proof that ſhe would not have been, if permitted to remain in peace, and yet will be, when peace is reſtored to her, as equitable as her neighbours. Should the Government ſeize a part of the effects of the wealthy for the defence of the country, that will give no more reaſon to expect an Agrarian Law, than raiſing twenty Millions annually in Britain gives reaſon to expect it will be afterwards equally divided among the people. Mr. Young well knew that there is a decree, making it death to propoſe an Agrarian Law, which has long been and ſtill is in *full force*, but it did not ſuit his impoſture to notice it. Whatever may be done in France, ought not to be aſcribed to the principles or rapacity of the people, but to the unparalleled exigency of the times. To ſupport her Liberties, indeed, the rich will probably be forced to pay what the poor cannot; and to this Mr. Young will not object, as he admits,

mits, p. 123, " In taxation, ſpeaking at large of " a nation, to quantum *paid* is not ſo much " the object to regard as the quantum *left* after " the taxes are paid."

But while I deny that any thing like proof can be produced of an Agrarian Law having taken place in France, I own that an extenſive and awful confiſcation has been made! What has been the occaſion of it?—Not a deſire to plunder and divide Property. It has been the folly, weakneſs, or wickedneſs of thoſe who have ſuffered; ſome of whom openly declared againſt the Conſtitution, and excited the invaſion of the country; others had made their hoſtile diſpoſition too manifeſt to be ſafe at home, therefore they fled; and the ruling power in Paris, finding the Emigrants were drawing out the wealth of the nation in order to make War upon it, ſeized the eſtates of all thoſe who did not appear within a limited time. Such as were friendly to the Conſtitution could have no objection to appear at their poſt, becauſe they were in no danger; and thoſe whoſe hoſtility was aſcertained by their abſence, deſerved to loſe their property; deſerved to loſe it on the principles of the Britiſh Government, which ſeized the property of the Rebels in 1715 and 1745, as greedily as the French Convention; and whoſe tremendous confiſcations in Ireland during the Commonwealth, (afterwards *confirmed* by Charles the IId.) and in the reign of William the IIId. ſurpaſs all that has hitherto been done in France; where, if mens' minds were reſtored to tranquillity by peace, and their country ſecure, the vengeance of enthuſiaſtic fury would

aſſuage,

aſſuage, and probably moſt of the fugitives would be reinſtated in their ancient inheritance and ſequeſtered property.

Beſides general pictures of French exceſſes, and miſconſtructions of the word Equality, Mr. Young continually maintains "Experiment," "Practice," and "Events," to be the only wiſe rule of conduct; and, alluding to the experiment of perſonal Repreſentation being attempted in France, for I deny that it has been made, he ſays, (p. 56) "The thing is tried; that method "of drilling has been experimented and found "good for nothing; the crop did not anſwer." But if two neighbouring farmers were to try a new theory, and the children of the one were to drive beaſts into their father's field, to nip the firſt ſhoots, to trample and deſtroy the corn as it ſprung from the earth, and his crop did not anſwer; while that of the other farmer, whoſe field was unmoleſted yielded an abundance beyond all expectation, could it, in ſuch a caſe, be juſtly ſaid the experiment failed? The farmers are France and America; the children are the Emigrants, and the beaſts are the Germans. The experiment of Repreſentative Government has not been allowed a ſufficient period to be made in France; for even if the field had been unmoleſted, the corn has not had time to vegetate, much leſs to fill and ripen. In America, the field was as much diſturbed, during ſeveral years, as in France, and accordingly produced nothing but weeds. But the theory was known to be good; it was perſiſted in, and when fair play was given to the ſoil, the crop was aſtoniſhing. So it will be with France, which at preſent,

ſent, in reſpect to Government, may be called a neglected or barren ſoil; for there is a more important duty than cultivating the field; the natives muſt defend it, or they will have no field to cultivate.

But ſays Mr. Young, the experiment has not finally been tried in America. No! Eighteen years is no experiment in America, though ſix months is a compleat experiment in France! "But America has ſuch a plenty of land that "ſhe has no poor; it is not her Repreſentative "Government that prevents there being any "poor, but it is the plenty of land. When ſhe "has a numerous indigent poor, her Govern-"ment will tumble to pieces; the mob will "not poſſeſs the Sovereign authority and re-"main hungry," continues he. I deny that it is her extent of territory alone that prevents her being burthened with a numerous indigent poor. Look at almoſt every country in Europe, not even excepting Britain and Ireland, and acres enough will be found to make thoſe who are now poor as comfortable as the American farmer,—I do not mean by an Agrarian Law; I mean by properly employing the waſte unoccupied lands. Look at the vaſt tracts in Germany, Hungary, and eaſtward towards the Black Sea, whoſe native fertility is doomed, by a barbarous policy, to feed wild beaſts inſtead of man; where whole countries, that would render millions happy, are made a blank on the earth by the reſtleſs deſolating ambition of bad Governments, or perhaps, to afford amuſement to one Tyrant. In Spain, the example of pride and indolence in the Nobles, has occaſioned ſuch a contempt and

neglect

neglect of Agriculture in the lower claſſes of ſociety who ought to attend to it, that population has decreaſed, and the nation become inſignificant in the ſcale of Europe compared with what it formerly was. The natives live chiefly on the natural productions of the ſoil, one of the richeſt in the world, which if properly cultivated, might maintain in greater plenty than at preſent, ſix times the number of inhabitants. "The extent of ground is of ſo little value "*without labour*," ſays Mr. Locke, "That I "have heard it affirmed, that in Spain itſelf, a "man may be permitted to plough, ſow, and "reap, without being diſturbed, upon land he "has no other title to, but only his making uſe "of it. But on the contrary, the inhabitants "think themſelves beholden to him, who by "his induſtry, on neglected, and conſequently "waſte land, has increaſed the ſtock of corn "which they wanted."

It would be ſuperfluous to point out ſimilar evils in the other European nations. With regard to France, under its old Government, which is more immediately intereſting to the queſtion, I deſire no more to be ſaid in ſupport of my opinion than what is contained in Mr. Young's own travels. It will there be found that it was not the great population of that country which occaſioned the poverty and wretchedneſs of the multitude, but that it was the monopoly of the land by a diſſolute tyrannical Nobility and Prieſthood, whoſe poſſeſſion operated effectually to diminiſh the produce of the ſoil, and to blaſt with ſterility thoſe plains upon which nature had laviſhed her richeſt bounty. The arbitrary and

enormous

enormous exactions of the Agents of the Government aggravated the diſtreſs of the people, among whom ly acres ſufficient to make them as happy as the American farmer. It is the miſerable policy of Governments that makes ſo many poor in Europe; and what is the cauſe of the people being in general much more happy and wealthy in Britain than in Germany? Not "Corruption," as thoſe who fatten by it would make us believe. It is becauſe we have much leſs of the old ſyſtem remaining; becauſe men are more enlightened, induſtry encouraged, and property better ſecured; becauſe our anceſtors have wrung from the hand of power and bequeathed us more Liberty than is enjoyed under any other Monarchy; nor can theſe bleſſings be preſerved but by that ſpirit which acquired them.

But it may ſtill be ſaid, America has more acres in proportion to the number of its inhabitants than any country in Europe. I ſhall not diſpute this, becauſe it is of no importance to my argument. I contend that there is a ſufficiency of acres in Europe to make every man as comfortable as the American farmer, and that the extent of territory in the New World does not alone prevent indigence among the people. It is the ſpirit of their Government, which encourages not only Agriculture, but Manufactures and Commerce, and diſcourages War. Look at Holland! The number of poor in Holland is perhaps as ſmall as in America, and certainly much leſs than in any other European nation; yet Holland contains very few, and thoſe very unproductive acres. It is the moſt populous ſpot in Europe, and, leaving her poor out of the

the calculation, is twenty times more populous than America. How happens it then, that with ſo few acres, and ſo many inhabitants, the multitude of the Dutch are even more wealthy and comfortable than the American farmer? Becauſe, though her Government is very defective, its ſpirit encourages induſtry, commerce, and œconomy, and always avoids War, unleſs forced into it by ſome inſidious friend. It is the encouragement given to Manufactures and Commerce, as well as Agriculture, rather than the quantity of acres, that makes a people rich and happy. Dr. Smith, and all profound political œconomiſts, affirm, every Artizan, Manufacturer, and Labourer, to be as valuable to a ſtate as acres of land, and that the greater the population, if Government animates and properly directs induſtry, the greater will be the riches of the country, and enjoyments of the people. It is wicked pernicious policy alone that proves, and ſuch ſhallow, or deluded politicians, as Mr. Young, who aſſert, that population is the cauſe of poverty, and that the richeſt man who ever lived, was Adam, becauſe he alone exiſted, and was landed proprietor of the whole world.

The view Mr. Young takes of America, with regard to paying taxes, is equally unfair with his "*Speculations*" reſpecting her Repreſentative Government. He ſays, that a Farmer in the Back Settlements may have plenty of beef, mutton, corn, wool; he may be rendered quite eaſy and happy, by a ſuperfluity of the neceſſaries of life, but for want of Circulation, of Commerce, he will not be

able to pay a ſingle Tax; and therefore when America is involved in a War, and called upon for Taxes, ſhe will be ruined. *When* ſhe is involved in a War!—But her Government will not every few years alarm, miſlead, and madden the people into one, becauſe the Government emanates *from* the people, *for* the people's benefit, and is not directed by an ambitious or ſelfiſh junto:—And it is unjuſt in Mr. Young to eſtimate the power of America to pay taxes by the farmers in the *back ſettlements*. He owns, that the duties laid on the diſtilleries in Scotland, do not pay for the collection, and ſays, that the expence of collecting taxes from the farmers in the back ſettlements, would alſo be more than could pay for their collection: would it not, therefore, be as fair to conclude, that Britain cannot pay taxes, becauſe the Scotch diſtilleries cannot, as to conclude that America cannot pay taxes, becauſe the farmers in the back ſettlements cannot? A little conſideration will ſhew us, that America, like Britain, has circulation and commerce; like London, Liverpool, Briſtol and Glaſgow; it has Philadelphia, Boſton, Charles-Town and New York:—theſe laſt, indeed, may not be ſo extenſive and rich as the former; but, two hundred years ago, London was not a fourth part ſo wealthy and populous as at preſent; and is not America daily increaſing her commerce, manufactures and population?

Thus, I think, Mr. Young's "Experiment," "Practice," and "Events," as applied to America, are wholly illuſory. Repreſentative Government has ſtood in Peace, and flouriſhed in America

America twelve years. " Yes," ſays he, " but " it will be deſtroyed when ſhe has a numerous " indigent poor."—*When* ſhe has an indigent poor;—but, that will never be, more than at preſent, while the ſpirit of her government prefers, as it now does, Peace and Induſtry, to War and Corruption. He would condemn Repreſentative Government from the " experiment" of a few months attempted in France, in the midſt of the moſt dreadful warefare ever known; but in America, " Experiment," " Practice," and " Events," which he ſays, ought to be the only rule of conduct, he would ſet wholly aſide, becauſe *there* he finds they are ſtrongly againſt him, and that he cannot hold up a *terrifying example* of what *has* happened. He would condemn Repreſentative Government in America on " ſpeculation" and " theory," which he a thouſand times ſays, ought never to guide us; he would condemn it by predicting, what *will* happen, not by ſhewing, what *has* happened. On the contrary, in France, the experiment of a few months, is to be our only guide, and theory and ſpeculation we are totally to diſregard; in America theory and ſpeculation are to be our only guide, and the experiment of twelve years we are totally to diſregard!!!—How Mr. Young can reconcile theſe palpable contradictions, or how any man, of the leaſt underſtanding, could be duped by them, is beyond my comprehenſion. It may juſtly be aſked of him, in his own words, " what " inducement have we, therefore, to liſten to " *your ſpeculations*, that condemn what all" *America* " feels to be good?"—(p. 85)

Hence, I think, I may fairly affirm, that in America, there is a noble inſtance of the bleſſings flowing from Repreſentative Government. The Revolution there, was at firſt, as much execrated as that of France now is. In 1777 the ſame invectives may be found in the proclamation of general Burgoyne, that in 1792 were brought forth in the manifeſto of the Duke of Brunſwick: "He appealed to the ſuffering "thouſands in the provinces, whether the pre"ſent unnatural rebellion has not been made "a foundation for the compleateſt ſyſtem of "Tyranny that ever God, in his diſpleaſure, ſuffer"ed for a time to be exerciſed over a froward "and ſtubborn generation. Arbitrary im"priſonment, confiſcation of property, perſe"cution, and torture, unprecedented in the "inquiſitions of the Romiſh Church, are among "the palpable enormities which verify the "affirmative. Theſe are inflicted by aſſemblies "and committees, who dare to profeſs them"ſelves Friends to Liberty, upon the moſt quiet "ſubjects, without diſtinction of age or ſex, for "the ſole crime, often for the ſole ſuſpicion, "of having adhered in principle to the govern"ment under which they were born, and to "which by every tie, divine and human, they "owe allegiance. To conſummate theſe ſhock"ing proceedings, the profanation of religion "is added to the moſt profligate proſtitution of "common ſenſe; the conſciences of men are "ſet at nought, and multitudes are compelled, "not only to bear arms, but alſo to ſwear ſub"jection, to an uſurpation they abhor." Here is an epitome of all that has been ſaid and written

againſt

againſt the French, and why ſhould we not ſuppoſe, that were they left to themſelves, they would ſoon become as orderly, peaceable, flouriſhing, and happy, as the Americans? France has the natural ſources to make merchants like Holland, manufacturers like Britain, and farmers like America. And, I believe, the concert of Princes, was firſt formed againſt her from a knowledge that a few years Peace, would make her people ſo wealthy, comfortable and happy, that inſtead of being a terrible warning, ſhe would be a ſeducing example to ſurrounding nations; that the Deſpots of the continent ſaw ariſing from the ruins of French Deſpotiſm, the fabrick of human felicity, and conſequently the harbinger of their deſtruction, and therefore they wiſhed to ſtrangle it. At preſent, France is neither an example, nor a warning; ſhe is in a ſtate of madneſs, occaſioned,—not by perſonal Repreſentation, as Mr. Young continually aſſerts, for he might as juſtly ſay, the ſhocking yellow fever which has juſt broke out in Philadelphia, is the effect of Repreſentative Government in America; but, by the infamous invaſion of the Duke of Brunſwick, and the treachery and alarm raging in her boſom. I therefore affirm, that an admirable proof of the utility of Repreſentative Government exiſts in America, and deny, that the experiment of perſonal Repreſentation has been even *tried*, much leſs "*compleatly made*" in France, or that ſhe ſhould either encourage, or deter us, from ſalutary Reform. France would not Reform till it was too late:—may her example, in that reſpect, be, indeed, a warning to Britain.

Having

Having ſhewn Mr. Young's fallacy in condemning Repreſentative Government in France upon "experiment," and in America upon "ſpeculation;" and having eſtabliſhed the experiment of America in my own favour, I ſhall now notice a few of the moſt miſchievous falſehoods, and abſurd contradictions, which he has advanced againſt Reform, but without ſtopping to examine every groundleſs aſſertion, and trivial argument. I ſhall take his leading reaſons only; the moſt unfounded and atrocious of which is, where he maintains, "that the "example of the King of France ſhould deter "all other Kings from liſtening to the com-"plaints of their ſubjects; he wiſhed to Re-"form; he was the firſt Monarch who was "deſirous of making his people happy, and *he* "*died for it on a ſcaffold.*"—It is difficult to ſay, whether the falſehood contained, or the Tyranny recommended in this paſſage, ſhould moſt provoke indignation! The falſehood is ſo well known, that none but Mr. Young could have had effrontery ſufficient to have aſſerted it; and the ſentiment conveyed is more dangerous to the liberties and happineſs of Britain, than all the works of Mr. Paine and the "Jacobin Societies." The King of France *did not* die on the ſcaffold becauſe he liſtened to Reform;—it was becauſe he would *not* liſten to it till it was *too late*;—till he was *compelled*. Inſtead of liſtening to Reform, he liſtened to evil Counſellors; he ſuffered himſelf to be guided by perſons who laviſhed the puplic money on uſeleſs placemen and penſioners; on favourites, paraſites, and the moſt pernicious of all traitors, *regular-bred courtiers*,

*courtiers*, who, to ſupply their prodigality, loaded the people with Taxes; and finding, at laſt, their profligate extravagance was on the eve of ruining them, agreed to Reform as their only chance of ſalvation. They firſt threatened the Parliament of Paris if it did not comply with their demands;—did that look like a wiſh to Reform? They next tried the ſhift of the Notables; but like their conduct with the Parliament of Paris, it alſo proved ineffectual; and after many other vain expedients, they were at laſt forced to call the States General, in hopes that they would cover their paſt iniquities, and grant a new leaſe for plundering the Nation. In that hope, however, they were alſo miſtaken. The people had long ſmarted with patience under the Tyranny of the Nobles, and extortions of the Government; they were now menaced with large additional burthens, and the general danger created a general alarm. The ſpirit of the country was rouſed by the infamy of the Adminiſtration; and finding the Court only ſtooped to conceſſion, to hide its miſmanagement, and inſure its future robberies, rather than from a ſincere wiſh to Reform and make them happy, the people reſolved no more to truſt to thoſe who had invariably betrayed them; the cauſe of the people triumphed; the rapacious views of the courtiers were defeated, and the old Deſpotiſm ſtripped of its riches and grandeur, was too feeble, ugly, and corrupt, to protract its exiſtence. Such was the commencement of the French Revolution. It was not the deſire of the King to *Reform*, but the deſire of his Miniſters to *rob*, that brought him to the ſcaffold.

All

All the calamities with which France is afflicted, are aſcribed, by Mr. Young, to perſonal Repreſentation, and the ſame are predicted in England, if any Reform of the Houſe of Commons takes place. Accordingly, a number of his paragraphs conclude with "Such is the "monſter, perſonal Repreſentation:"—"Such "the reſult of that Conſtitution founded on "perſonal Repreſentation:"—"Power, in the "hands of the people, by means of perſonal "Repreſentation, has ruined France:" &c.—And thus he proceeds, aſſerting, that all the misfortunes in which that nation is involved, are the conſequence of the will of the people, being ſupreme. In anſwer to this, which is the *ſole object* of his book, I ſhall ſhew, firſt, that he contradicts himſelf, and that the very reverſe of what he ſo often repeats and labours to eſtabliſh, may be proved by his own words; and ſecondly, that the experiment of Perſonal Repreſentation has not been attempted in France, till *after* the downfal of Monarchy, and, therefore, it *cannot* juſtly be blamed with producing that event, or the tranſactions which preceded.

P. 91, he ſays, that "if the Houſe of Commons "were ſuch Repreſentatives" (as in France) "they *would be guided* by the folly, madneſs, "and paſſions of the people." Seven pages further on, however, he thinks quite differently, and that "Repreſentation deſtroys itſelf, and "generates with infallible certainty an oligarchy "of mobbiſh demagogues, till of all other "voices, that *leaſt heard* is the *real* will of the "people."—Again (p. 106.) he maintains, that "a Par-

" a Parliament conſtituted on perſonal Repre-
" ſentation *can* act *no otherwiſe* than by the
" *immediate impulſe* of the people." But this, he ten pages before, affirms to be wrong; he thinks, " a word however, might be ſaid on
" the point of perſonal Repreſentation, rendering
" the will of the people *ſupreme*. The *futility*
" of the idea is demonſtrated, in the Aſſemblies *ſo*
" *choſen*, in France; their firſt merit, on Jaco-
" bin principles, is, that of ſpeaking the ſove-
" reign will of the people, by which expreſſion,
" is always underſtood the Majority: But, ſo
" truly abominable, is this ſyſtem of Govern-
" ment, that there has not been a ſingle in-
" ſtance of great and marked importance, in
" which the *Minority*, and commonly, a *very*
" *ſmall Minority*, has not, by means of terror,
" carried all before them."—Thus, he at one time affirms, that the will of the people " *would*
" guide" perſonal Repreſentatives, and yet, that among ſuch Repreſentatives, the will of the people would be " *leaſt* heard."—That perſonal Repreſentatives " can act *no otherwiſe*, than
" by the *immediate impulſe* of the peo-
" ple," and that every inſtance, of great and marked importance, in France, has, by means of terror, been carried by the will of a *very ſmall Minority!*—Theſe contradictions are fatal to all Mr. Young has written, and are a juſt illuſtration of the whole *fairneſs* of his book.

His inconſiſtency, in condemning perſonal Repreſentation, might be farther expoſed, but it will ſhorten the ſubject much to ſhew, that the caſe of France is wholly inapplicable, and is neither an example, nor a warning to Britain,

with regard to Reform, particularly as applied by Mr. Young. The Aſſembly which framed the Conſtitution of 1789, was not elected by univerſal ſuffrage, nor agreeably to any new ſyſtem of Reform. It was elected according to the rules, and under the direction of the French Monarchy; according to a ſyſtem eſtabliſhed for centuries. Reform, or Perſonal Repreſentation, therefore, are no more to be blamed for what it did, that was blameable, than they would be, if our Houſe of Commons were to exterminate every Friend to Liberty, and eſtabliſh Deſpotiſm in England. The Conſtituent Aſſembly was elected according to the old "Mild benignant" French Monarchy; according to a ſyſtem, "The work of the wiſdom of ages; yet it was that very Aſſembly which Mr. Burke reprobated, and Mr. Paine applauded, and againſt which the Convention at Pilnitz, the foundation of the preſent War, was formed. It was the authority of that Aſſembly which the Britiſh Government would never fully recognize: It is that Aſſembly which Lords Auckland and Hood, and even Mr. Young deſcribe, when they mention "The miſcreants, who, for *four* "*years*, diſtracted France." Then why ſhould the tranſactions of that Aſſembly deter us from Reform, ſince it was elected according to the Conſtitution of the Old French Deſpotiſm? It ſhould rather be an argument *in favour* of Reform, becauſe, according to Mr. Young and others, it produced much miſchief, and it was an old UNREFORMED Aſſembly.

The ſecond Aſſembly was not elected by univerſal ſuffrage, and of the third Aſſembly, it is

uncandid to ſpeak, for, during its exiſtence, it has rather been the Council of War of a great Army, than the ſeat of Peace and temperate Legiſlation: and it might as reaſonably be concluded, that the Britiſh Government is deſpotic, becauſe, for the ſake of diſcipline, Deſpotiſm muſt be exerciſed in the Britiſh Camp under the Duke of York, as to conclude that Anarchy, Confuſion, and Deſpotiſm, are the certain accompanyments of French Principles of Liberty, and will always be exerciſed by the Convention.

Having now ſhewn the inconſiſtency with which Mr. Young would build up his "Warning" againſt perſonal Repreſentation, by which he always means Reform, having alſo ſhewn that the French Revolution, and the calamities afflicting that country, did not ariſe *from* perſonal Repreſentation, which has neither had time nor opportunity to operate there; and that therefore the tranſactions in France have no analogy whatever with Parliamentary Reform in this kingdom; I ſhall, for a while quit French affairs to examine what Mr. Young ſays of the Britiſh Conſtitution, and particularly of the Houſe of Commons.

"But" (ſays he, p. 92) "the Houſe of "Commons are corrupted and bribed. And "if the nature of ſuch an Aſſembly demands "to be corrupted in order to purſue the public "good, who but a Viſionary can wiſh to re-"move Corruption?" Muſt not an Aſſembly, conſtituted for the public good, be of a moſt *deteſtable nature*, if it demands to be bribed in order to diſcharge its duty? Again, "In-"fluence, or, as Reformers call it, Corrup-

" tion, is the oil which makes the machine of " Government go well." And p. 171. " Ex- " TRAVAGANT COURTS, SELFISH MINISTERS, " *and* CORRUPT MAJORITIES, are ſo " intimately interwoven with our practical " Freedom, that it would require better poli- " tical Anatomiſts, than our modern Reformers, " to ſhew, on fact, that we did not owe our " Liberty to the identical Evils which they " want to expunge." Could the whole National Convention more groſsly Libel the King, the Miniſters, and the Parliament, of this Country? Surely, Mr. Young muſt have known, that he was writing the moſt bitter and dangerous ſatire on our Government, when he ſaid, that extravagant Courts, Selfiſh Miniſters, and *Corrupt Majorities*, were intimately interwoven with our Freedom, and yet aſſert, that this is " that glorious Conſtitution which is the inhe- " ritance and pride of Britons!" I appeal to every candid man whether the friends to the Liberty of the Preſs, or Mr. Young, ſeem moſt diſpoſed " *to publiſh the Corruptions of the* " *Conſtitution*, in other words, *to write it* " *down*. (vide p. 163.)

In anſwering this frontleſs avowal of Corruption, I muſt ſuppoſe the Houſe of Commons compoſed of either good or bad men. If they are the former, and are ſuffered to exerciſe their own diſcretion, they will purſue the public welfare without Corruption, unleſs it is preſumed they cannot ſee it without the explanation of a Bank Note. If they are bad men, they will be bribed to do evil as readily as good. It may indeed be ſaid, that influence is often neceſſary to make

make a virtuous man do a virtuous action; and that is true: For, although a virtuous man will act virtuously when he does act, yet there are occasions where he is not called upon by duty to act at all: But on the contrary, a Member of Parliament *is in duty bound* to act, to take either one side or another; and if he is a good man, he will act for the best, according to his conscience, without either Corruption or Influence. It is an absurdity to say, that a man can be *corrupted* to act *virtuously*; because if he acts from a corrupt motive, he is equally vicious whether the action be good or bad, and will not much consider whether he does right or wrong, while his primary object, Corruption, is obtained. The same reasoning will apply to the assertion, that "a man may be bribed to act "wisely;" unless the man is supposed to be a fool. Nor do I understand how a man can be *influenced* to do good, for, in a case, like that of the House of Commons, where he *must* act, he must be predispos'd to do evil before he can be influenced to do good, and consequently he must be a bad man: And all the arguments in favour of Influence, do, in fact, go to prove, that the Members of the House of Commons, are traitors to the State, who would ruin it if they were not influenced to the contrary. As Mr. Young has quoted Dr. Johnson's definition of "*Principle*," I will take what the same author says of "*To Influence*," which is, "to modify "to *any* purpose." If Influence, therefore, can modify to *any* purpose, (which it certainly can, or else it is no longer Influence;) and if our House of Commons is, as Mr. Young asserts,

directed

directed by Influence, then it is the mere creature of the Executive Power which poſſeſſes that Influence; and it is a miſtake to ſuppoſe that it makes laws, or does either a good or a bad action: It is the King's Miniſters, who, holding the Influence that directs it, ought to by wholly blamed or thanked for whatever it does; becauſe, they may *influence* it to the moſt wicked, as well as the moſt wiſe meaſures; and it would be better, if the "Monſter," as Mr. Young calls it, were annihilated, for then morality would not be wounded; Government would be carried on at a leſs expence, and with more eaſe and vigour; and Miniſters would be much more reſponſible for their conduct.

But while I maintain influencing or corrupting the Repreſentative Body by the Executive Power (which in this country, is not, I hope, the caſe, notwithſtanding Mr. Young's aſſertions) to be the moſt pernicious of all Policy, and the blackeſt of all Treaſon; I am far from maintaining that Members of Parliament ſhould not be rewarded for their trouble: On the contrary, I think they ſhould be openly paid a regular, ample ſtipend; but it ſhould be paid merely as a reward for their trouble, and not as an equivalent for their honeſty; they ſhould publicly receive a certain ſum, and not ſecretly take a recompence which they are aſhamed to own. If it were the cuſtom, that our Ambaſſadors ſhould receive no pay from our own Government, and were permitted to take as much as they could procure from the Courts to which they were ſent, can it be doubted that they would ſacrifice our intereſt for that of thoſe

from

from whom they expected a reward? In like manner, it would be folly to ſuppoſe that a Parliament penſioned by the Government, would guard the intereſts of the people againſt the Government.

I am at a loſs to conceive how the Corruption of the Houſe of Commons can be deemed the *cauſe* of our proſperity and happineſs, nor have I ever ſeen any fact produced tending to prove it. It is aſſerted, that we are proſperous and happy, and admitted that Corruption does exiſt; and, therefore, it is inferred, becauſe Corruption is a part of the ſyſtem which makes us proſperous and happy, *that it is the cauſe* of our proſperity and happineſs. But nothing can, I think, be more falſe than this inference: It might as juſtly be inferred, that a mixture of weeds, among the corn, is the cauſe of a plentiful harveſt; that the droſs mixed in the ore with gold and ſilver, is the cauſe of their value; or that inſects and locuſts are the cauſe of a luxuriant herbage. Would a tradeſman aſcribe his accumulation of wealth to the pilfering of his till by his ſhopman? Corruption may, indeed, be a *part* of a ſyſtem, good upon the whole; but it is a *bad* part, and ought to be removed. It is not to Corruption we are to attribute our proſperity and happineſs, but to the ſpirit and induſtry of the people.

I ſhall now conſider the queſtion of Reform under four diſtinct heads, and in doing ſo, ſhall aim at brevity, and endeavour, as much as poſſible, to avoid a repetition of the many arguments which have been advanced in favour of it. I ſhall examine

The

The neceſſity of Reforming the Houſe of Commons.

How far a Reform can be made in conformity with the ſpirit, principles, and practice, of the Conſtitution.

The time for making a Reform.

What the nature of the Reform ſhould be.

Of the NECESSITY of Reform, the removal of Mr. Young's *ſalutary* Corruption, is, the ſtrongeſt proof; for Corruption, if practiſed, muſt deſtroy the whole original deſign of the Houſe of Commons, which, even according to to himſelf, was to *adviſe* the King in important matters of State. Now, as advice does not mean aſſent, but muſt often be contrary to the opinions and wiſhes of thoſe who aſk it; and as it is well known, that the King cannot act contrary to the advice of his Commons, it is, in fact, a controul, a command. If, therefore, Corruption or Influence makes them adviſe the King to whatever he recommends, their controul is loſt, and the King is as abſolute as the Empreſs of Ruſſia, ſo long as he poſſeſſes the means to *influence*. "If "Courts *can* be perfidious, you are to ſuppoſe "they *will* be ſo; and if you have not ſo pro- "vided as to turn that perfidy to the benefit of "the people, you confeſs at once, that your "Conſtitution is viſionary," ſays Mr. Young (p. 68,)—If ſo, what proviſion is there againſt the perfidy of the Britiſh Court, while it dictates to Parliament by its Influence? With Corruption and Influence, then, our Houſe of Commons muſt be an illuſion, and a dangerous illuſion; becauſe, it is not reſponſible, and takes off all reſponſibility from the Crown. It muſt

give

give a falſe appearance of ſanction, and bind the people to whatever the Crown propoſes, and pays for with the money taken from the people: It would be as if a Court of Law were to grant to a highwayman a licenſe to rob, upon condition that he paid into it a part of his plunder. With Corruption, our Houſe of Commons, would be both *uſeleſs* and EXPENSIVE; but I am far, very far from believing, it is governed by Corruption, and I think it my duty here to remark, on the ſhameleſs effrontery of Mr. Reeves, in thanking Mr. Young for aſſerting, that we are governed by extravagant Courts, ſelfiſh Miniſters, and corrupt Majorities (vide p. 171.) and alſo, to expreſs my ſurpriſe, that the Houſe of Commons has not addreſſed the King, or that the Attorney General has not been commanded to proſecute in his book, that which in Mr Horne Took's petition, reſpecting the Weſtminſter Election, was, by all parties, deemed the moſt groſs and ſcandalous libel that ever came before them.

Mr. Young aſſerts, and, indeed, it is the common doctrine of all thoſe who coincide with him in opinion, that the Houſe of Commons was always deſigned to repreſent, not the people at large, but the people of property, in the kingdom. Admitting this to be a fact, let us ſee how far its preſent ſtate agrees with the deſign. Are the paupers of Stockbridge, Barnſtable, Seaford, all the boroughs in Cornwall, and a majority of the boroughs in the kingdom, the men of property? Why are the wealthy Inhabitants of St. Mary-le-bonne, and other pariſhes in London, who in point of property,

are able to buy the electors of a majority of the House of Commons, excluded from sending Representatives? Why are the wealthy Merchants and Manufacturers of Manchester, Sheffield, Birmingham, and even of London, denied their right of voting? But, it will probably be said, a rich and commercial man, may, at the expence of five thousands pounds, procure a seat in Parliament, if he desires it, and this shews the utility of the rotten boroughs, and proves that property, predominates in the House of Commons: To this I ask, will a commercial, or any other man, lay out five thousand pounds without the prospect of a return? If we see a rich avaricious man, expending immense sums, to obtain the influence over a borough, we cannot mistake his object; it must be with him an adventure, a speculation, which he hopes, will, in one way or another, return a proportionate profit. And the mischief is, that the traffic may not be merely confined to British subjects, but may, by foreign Princes, be converted into the means of ruling our Councils, and ruining us as a nation; for, if Mr. Pitt spoke truly, when he declared, "it was notorious "that the Nabob of Arcot had fifteen Mem-"bers in that House, and that they did not act "upon an identity of interest with the people," why may not any other Prince send in his members, and by expending a million sterling, take the money out of Englishmen's pockets, and force them to fight his battles? If it be said, though the Electors are poor, the Representatives are wealthy, I answer, that we not only find beggarly boroughs, but needy members

sitting

ſitting for them. And as to " the property of the kingdom being in the hands of the mem- " bers *," I will aſk where is the property (diveſted of their places and penſions, and other political emoluments) of Meſſ. Pitt, Dundas, Jenkinſon, Long, Roſe, Steele, Addington, and Burke? Theſe are the leading men in Parliament, yet, according to Mr. Young's argument, they muſt lead to miſchief, becauſe they have little or no property.—Look at the oppoſition:—See, (according to Mr. Young's argument again) what ample ſecurity we have that they will act for the public good, becauſe they have large poſſeſſions. Meſſ. Grey, Whitbread, Lambton, Byng, Wharton, M. A. Taylor, Baker, Lord Wycombe, &c. &c. either poſſeſs, or are immediate heirs, to large eſtates; and Meſſ. Erſkine and Sheridan are of all others, intereſted in the peace and proſperity of the country, as their lucrative incomes from the bar and the theatre, would be the firſt ſpecies of property likely to ſuffer from a convulſion.—Go up to the Houſe of Peers, and ſearch for the property (places and Penſions excepted) of Lords Grenville, Hawkebury, Chatham, Auckland, and Loughborough. Compare the leaders of adminiſtration and oppoſition throughout, and it will be found, that the former are poor, and the latter are wealthy;—Nay, take the aggregate of the number, and fortunes of " the Jacobin Society of the " Friends of the People," and compare them with the Houſe of Commons, (places and pen-

Young p. 84

ſions excepted) and they will, perhaps, be found to be as wealthy and reſpectable, as that pure body. If, as Mr. Young aſſerts, property were to be the foundation of our confidence in public men, there would inſtantly be a change in adminiſtration, and a Reform of Parliament. I therefore deny, that in the conſtruction of the Houſe of Commons, there is any operating principle or controul, which ſecures the protection of property, more than there is among a club of ſtock-brokers, whoſe primary object always is their own immediate advantage, whether it be connected with the welfare of the nation, or not. Hence, if we are to be guided, by what Mr. Young affirms, of the Houſe of Commons, that *it is a Repreſentation of property*, a Reform becomes as indiſpenſible as upon any other principle. What, though ſome members are men of property, they may conſent to invade the poſſeſſions of the rich in general, becauſe they may receive a private compenſation that will not only reimburſe their own perſonal loſs, but plentifully reward them for betraying the intereſts of men of property at large, who have no more controul over them, than the Swiniſh multitude of Mancheſter and Birmingham. Diſtribute the elective franchiſe, equally among men of property, and I am content, becauſe I believe ſuch a diſtribution would render the Houſe of Commons independent of the Government, which is the true object of any Reform.

It may, perhaps, be ſaid, our Conſtitution, originally, recognized only as men of property the owners of landed eſtates; that they all now have

have votes, and therefore the ancient ſpirit is preſerved. Without enquiring into the abuſes of County Elections, or ſhewing the futility of the expectation, that eighty county members, could ſecure us againſt four hundred and ſeventy-eight from cities and rotten boroughs, I ſhall content myſelf at preſent with aſſerting, that the ancient ſpirit, principles, and "*Practice*," of the Conſtitution, recognized as men, who had a right to be conſulted in the National Councils, all who were of CONSIDERATION, whether by Landed Property, as at firſt was the caſe, or by Manufactures or Commerce, which afterwards occaſioned Citizens and Burgeſſes to be called to Parliament, and which now are of much more importance to the kingdom than all its land. I ſhall ſhew this more fully when I conſider how far a Reform can be conſtitutionally made. At preſent, I ſhall only aſſert, that according to the original principles, and practice, of the Conſtitution, and according to Mr. Young's definition of what the Houſe of Commons *is*, (a Repreſentation, not of Perſons, but of Property), a Reform is abſolutely neceſſary, becauſe it neither agrees with what it originally was, and now ought to be, nor with his deſcription of it; for Property is not even ſo much repreſented in the Houſe of Commons as Perſons.

Such, upon the principles of the Anti-Reformers, is the neceſſity of reforming Parliament; and if the practical evils ariſing from the defective Repreſentation are conſidered, they will be found ſtill more urgent in favour of that meaſure. It is, I believe, univerſally admitted,

admitted, that the proſperity of this country has ariſen from the ſuperior portion of Freedom enjoyed by its inhabitants, above thoſe of the ſurrounding nations: If that be the caſe, the continuance of our proſperity muſt depend on the continuance of our Freedom; and, if we find the Houſe of Commons eaſily agreeing to narrow the latter, we cannot expect that the former will have a very long exiſtence. The ready acquieſcence to laying on additional burthens; the profuſion of the public money, and the invariable, enormous accumulation of debt, demonſtrate the certainty, that at ſome time, we muſt reach the ſummit of the borrowing ſyſtem: And even before this natural death of our public credit, the flames of ſome unneceſſary War may melt the waxen wings, on which, like Icarus, we have towered to ſuch an unnatural heighth. But what is more immediately alarming, the moſt arbitrary laws are found neceſſary, and are enacted, to enſure the collection of the Revenue: Thoſe Laws are deſtructive of Freedom, and conſequently muſt deſtroy our proſperity, for they openly and unequivocally invade our Liberties, and tend gradually to aboliſh and totally to annihilate them. The Right of an Engliſhman to a Trial by a Jury of his equals, has long been eſteemed the deareſt he poſſeſſes; but this, in certain caſes, which, with the increaſe of our debt, are annually accumulating, is compleatly aboliſhed. It is not that juſtice is done between man and man that conſtitutes Liberty, ſo much as that juſtice is done between the Government and the People. In the moſt arbitrary and tyrannical

rannical Monarchies, ſtrict juſtice is generally adminiſtered between individuals; nay, it is more eaſy to be obtained, perhaps, than in Britain, becauſe the expence is leſs. All men act juſtly, unleſs they have an intereſt in acting otherwiſe: Deſpots, therefore, can have no intereſts in deciding partially between individuals: On the contrary, they will be eager to do rigid juſtice, in order to palliate their own robberies. Of what importance, then, is it, that we have Juries to try actions between John and William? Theſe might be as fairly decided, if there were no other Jury than the twelve, or four Judges. It is in caſes between the Crown and People that injuſtice is to be guarded againſt. Yet, we find Parliament yearly ſanctioning in the Exciſe, Stamp, and other Revenue Laws, the gradual Abolition of the Trial by Jury; becauſe, according to the late Earl of Chatham and Sir George Saville, their Corruption involved us in the American War, which brought a debt of an hundred Millions on our heads; and, according to Mr. Young, they are now to add another hundred to deſtroy a combination of Reformers; i. e. to preſerve to Lords Camelford and Egremont the privilege of ſending Members to Parliament for the Sheep Cots of old Sarum, and the Stones of Midhurſt! And to preſerve "Extravagant Courts, Selfiſh "Miniſters, and Corrupt Majorities! ! !" (vide p. 171.)

The oppreſſive operation of thoſe Revenue Laws, particularly of the Exciſe, has often been ably demonſtrated. During the preſent Adminiſtration, they have been eagerly extended.

What

What can be more vexatious than that the Stamp Office ſhould keep in its pay Informers, who, before they will be ſuch, muſt have loſt all ſenſe of ſhame or honeſty; who muſt have abandoned all hopes of ever being reſpectable in ſociety, and who, conſequently, muſt hate, and become the enemies of mankind, becauſe they know mankind deſpiſe and deteſt them? What can be more vexatious or deſtructive of Freedom, than that one of theſe reptiles may go into a tradeſman's ſhop, purchaſe a pair of gloves, and by quirk or perjury, (for the oath of ſuch a miſcreant, is ſufficient, and is taken in preference to that of the moſt reſpectable tradeſman) fine the vender in ten guineas, half of which goes to himſelf? Is this tried by a Jury? No. Who tries it? A Magiſtrate, or two, appointed by, and receiving a ſalary, from the proſecutor, (the Government;) it is tried by men who ſubſiſt on the fund to which the other half of the penalty is carried, and who, therefore, in a certain degree, have a common intereſt with the Informer. For additional inſtances of this kind, beſides the Exciſe, Farming of Taxes, &c. conſult the Hatters, Perfumers, and many other Shopkeepers. Liberty, which animates the induſtry and enterprize of the people, and is univerſally allowed to have been the cauſe of our proſperity, can no more exiſt under a continual extenſion of theſe laws, than ice in a furnace; and when once the cauſe is removed, the effect will not long remain. Whether the Houſe of Commons, as at preſent conſtituted, is likely to encreaſe or diminiſh the debt, which gives birth to theſe proceedings, is obvious.

obvious. Here I will not take theory, but Mr. Young's favourite "Practice," and according to practice, our debt will rapidly increaſe, and our Freedom as rapidly vaniſh. Spain, was once the moſt powerful, becauſe the moſt free nation in Europe: Her Cortes reſembled our Parliament, but were, perhaps, much more pure. Corruption, indolence, pride, and oppreſſion*, ſtole into her government, from whence they were imbibed by her Nobles, and her People: Her Freedom, of courſe, gradually diſappeared, until its bare remembrance was loſt; and behold now, how wretched are her inhabitants; how inſignificant as a nation!

Beſides, the ready acquieſcence to Taxes, and to the arbitrary Laws found neceſſary to exact them; there are other circumſtances, not leſs urgent in favour of Parliamentary Reform. Why were not the violators of the Conſtitution in the caſe of the Middleſex Election puniſhed? Why was Lord Mansfield permitted to impriſon Bingley two years againſt the Law? Why were Miniſters allowed to continue the American War without the ſhadow of ability, or a hope of ſucceſs, during ſeveral years, after the nation diſapproved of it? Or what is more recent, why was not an inquiry granted into the conduct of Mr. Roſe, in the Weſtminſter Elec-

* The moſt deteſtable means of her oppreſſion, was, the Inquiſition, which has been long proverbially execrated by every honeſt Briton; yet, Mr. Young ſays, were he a Spaniſh Miniſter, he would not aboliſh it! Probably he wiſhes to introduce it into England, and to place it under the direction of Mr. Reeves, than whom not a more fit Director could be found.

tion? Why have the chief agitators of the Manchester, Mount-street, and Birmingham Riots escaped justice? To these queries, Mr. Young, will, perhaps, answer, "Why! Because, all "those measures were only oiling the machinery "of Government, to make it go smoothly; "they were only some of the oil of Influence, "which is Corruption, in the eyes of Re-"formers."

It is not necessary to enumerate the pensioning of Magistrates, building of Barracks, and a thousand other similar instances, in order to convince every unprejudiced mind, towards what centre the whole transactions of Parliament gravitate; nor might it be safe to animadvert on them freely. Let those, who desire a more perfect illustration, read the late History of this Country, and particularly of the present Ministers, where they may collect a sufficient number to fill a volume. Shew me one instance, during the boasted administration of the last ten years, in which the House of Commons has supported the interests of the People, and of justice, in opposition to the wishes of the Crown? If it can be shewn, that, upon one or two marked occasions, it has done this, then, I may think, its misconduct rather the effect of error, than of criminal acquiescence: But if this cannot be shewn, then I must either conclude, our present Governors to be the wisest that ever existed in the world, since they have not erred once in ten years, or that Parliament is so servile as never to thwart them. In the case of the late Russian Armament, the House of Commons, having no sympathy of senti-

ment

ment with the nation, voted, according to the wiſhes of the miniſters, firſt for, and then againſt, a meaſure. What was the conſequence of this? They were proved to have acted contrary, and the Miniſter afterwards to have acted in conformity, to the will of the people. By this means all the public eſteem was transferred to Mr. Pitt, which would have fallen to the Repreſentatives of the people, if they had done their duty. Our Premier, in this way, has artfully gained all his popularity; for, while he affects to deſpiſe the will of the people, he, rather than hazard his ſituation, obeys it on all dangerous occaſions. And, as in the Ruſſian Armament, he robbed the Houſe of Commons, ſo in the preſent War, he robbed the Crown of the public affection; for, when the calamities it brought on were daily rendering it more unpopular, his friends induſtriouſly circulated a report, that it was then continued quite againſt his inclination, but that higher powers (meaning the King and his friends) would have it ſo. By this means, his popularity was at once preſerved, both among thoſe who wiſhed to terminate, and thoſe who wiſhed to continue the War. It has hitherto been the practice, that when any Act of Grace was to be done, the King, by being made the inſtrument in performing it, ſhould reap all the advantage ariſing from the national gratitude: Mr. Pitt, however, has reverſed this cuſtom; and when any odious meaſure is to take place, the Crown is made not only the agent, but the parent of it, while his friends exculpate him, by ſhruggs, and hints of regret, at the neceſſity of ſubmitting. Thus we

find him at once robbing both the King and Commons of the public eſteem and gratitude, and throwing all that is unfortunate or obnoxious to their charge: He puts himſelf where the Monarch formerly ſtood; becomes the diſpenſer of every thing that is gracious, and by this artful unconſtitutional conduct, concentrates in his perſon all that is to be admired and beloved, either in the executive or legiſlative power, and filches a popularity, not more unnatural, than formidable and alarming.

Notwithſtanding the contumely with which the will of the people, calmly expreſſed in an aſſembly of Delegates, is treated by the Anti-Reformers, yet they often juſtify their own conduct on that very will which they affect to condemn: If it is ſaid, a Parliamentary Reform is neceſſary, in order to aſcertain the will of the people in a peaceable conſtitutional manner, they anſwer, Parliament ought not to be guided by the will of the people, and therefore a Reform is needleſs: But throw the blame of the American War on Parliament, and they ſhift their ground, they change ſides, and boaſt that it was popular. They juſtify themſelves in commencing the American War, on the will of the people, and yet they deny that the will of the people ſhould be their guide! It is neceſſary this ſhould be decided; Either let the will of the people, or the will of Parliament, ſince they are to be diſtinct things, be the rule of action. If the will of Parliament is to be the rule, then the blame of the American War attaches to them alone, and juſtifies a Reform, in order to prevent another ſuch evil: If the

will

will of the people is to be the rule, then, as the Houſe of Commons voted directly againſt it, in the caſe of the Ruſſian Armament, that Armament juſtifies a Reform alſo.

But it will not be improper to enquire a little into the nature of the Will of the People. Upon examination, it will be found to be of two very diſtinct kinds, the one originating with themſelves, their own pure offſpring, the other, a courtly baſtard. A clear inſtance of the latter may be found in the fate of Mr. Fox's Eaſt India Bill, which paſſed the Houſe of Commons without a murmur among the people, and was even approved, till the ſecret adviſers of the Crown raiſed an alarm about charters, and ſucceeded, in ſtimulating the public, to expreſs the ſtrongeſt diſapprobation of the meaſure. The popularity of the American War was alſo hatched in the Cabinet. The national indignation was inſidiouſly rouſed, by holding up the refuſal of the Americans to pay taxes, like ourſelves, while the true cauſe of the quarrel, the queſtion of Repreſentation, was kept in the back ground, or, if ſtarted, was anſwered, by the abuſes in our own;—by inſtancing Manchester, Birmingham, &c.—by the deformity of the Britiſh Houſe of Commons, was the American War juſtified, and therefore, had a Reform taken place twenty years ago, one chief ſophiſtical pretext of that unhappy War, had not exiſted. It is likewiſe a courtly popularity, which has ſanctioned the preſent War. Proclamations, camps, and addreſſes, were not regarded with indifference; Mr. Penſioner Reeves, from the Court, ſounded the trumpet of alarm, and

was

was echoed by the whole kingdom; thus a popularity, originating in the Cabinet, was given to the War, which I call a courtly baſtard popularity. But how was the American War ſtopped, or a War with Ruſſia prevented? Not by an expreſſion of the public will, created in, and directed by the Cabinet, but by an expreſſion of the public will, emanating purely from the people themſelves, and in direct oppoſition to the wiſhes of the Cabinet. On theſe occaſions, the people could not be duped; and I think the will of the people, that ſanctioned in its commencement, and the will of the people that brought to a concluſion, the American War, were as different in their nature as in their object. Miniſters will always be attempting to create theſe baſtard courtly wills, for their own ſelfiſh purpoſes, to the injury of the nation; it is the duty of the Houſe of Commons to detect and expoſe them, and to guard the people from being duped into ruin; but, inſtead of this, we find the Houſe of Commons generally the chief inſtrument in promoting the deluſion: in the Ruſſian Armament they were notoriooufly ſo. And therefore, to make them more careful of the intereſts of the people: to unmaſk, rather than cover the courtly deſigns, a Reform has become neceſſary.

Theſe two different wills of the people were to be traced in the ſentiments and conduct of the Alarmiſts and Anti-Reformers laſt winter. They exulted in the univerſal loyalty of the country, in the general affection of the people for the Conſtitution, and in their concurrence in the meaſures of government; they exulted

in

in the *courtly* will of the people. But when the queſtion of Reform was ſtarted they deprecated the will of the people as the mother of every calamity. If the War was conſidered, they vaunted that the will of the people was in its favour;—if Reform was conſidered, they reprobated the will of the people as the moſt miſchievous of all guides. Was it ever boaſted, or given as an argument in ſupport, of a meaſure, that the will ot the people was againſt it?—No.—Is not the reverſe almoſt always the caſe?—Yes. Is not this proof of the neceſſity of knowing the will of the people, and conſequently of Reform? Did not thoſe who boaſted the general approbation of the War, and the meaſures of government, and thereby applaud the Will of the people, in fact confeſs the neceſſity of Reform?—Nay, a more important confeſſion is to be found in the deſcription the Houſe of Commons gives of itſelf. In impeachments, ſuch as that now carrying on againſt Mr. Haſtings, they proſecute in the name of ALL the Commons of Great Britain. Thus they themſelves own, they ought to be elected by univerſal ſuffrage; for to act in the name of *all*, without conſulting, or even of being capable of knowing the will of the *Majority*, appears to be inconſiſtent with common ſenſe. And of this Mr. Young ſeems aware, when he aſſerts, (p. 90,) that the Houſe of Commons *are not* the Repreſentatives of the People, and ought not to be ſo called. Yet, it was for this very ſame aſſertion, that the Sheffield and Nottingham petitions for Reform were rejected laſt ſeſſion of Parliament, and even

deemed

deemed libellous! Is it not, therefore, extraordinary, that Mr. Reeves ſhould recommend a book, containing the ſame aſſertions, which the Houſe of Commons deemed a libel, when contained in a petition? And is it not ſtill more extraordinary, that the very men, who bellowed ſo much about the dignity of the Houſe being inſulted by thoſe petitions, ſhould reward Mr. Young with a place, for writing that, which, in St. Stephen's Chapel, they affected to condemn!

The addreſſes, aſſociations, and general approbation of them, I conſider to be direct confeſſions, of the neceſſity of Reform, becauſe they are confeſſions of the utility of knowing the will of the people. The Houſe of Commons was inſtituted for collecting and expreſſing that will, and ought ſtill to do it; a Houſe of Commons purely elected, being the only Conſtitutinal mouth-piece of the people. For the government, therefore, to ſeek the ſenſe of the country, in addreſſes and aſſociations, and to pretend to be guided by the public will, when co'lected in that partial irregular manner, is, I think, highly unconſtitutional, and a moſt dangerous innovation, tending to ſuperſede the uſe of the Houſe of Commons altogether. Nor, are our affiliated ſocieties, leſs eager to embark in all ſuch meaſures, than government are to encourage them. Acting in conformity to the ſpirit which firſt animated them, they ſtill imitate the French; for, as the Convention decreed, on the 22d of November 1793, that no prieſt ſhould receive his penſion without producing a certificate of his having paid contributions of civiſm; ſo they have ſet on foot civil contributions for flannel

waiſtcoats

waiſtcoats, in all the public offices, to which thoſe clerks, who did not ſubſcribe, may ſee reaſon to believe, that they will be conſidered as *ſuſpected perſons*, and may even loſe their places. The Archduke Charles has alſo publiſhed a proclamation, ſoliciting patriotic gifts, and voluntary contributions, from all well diſpoſed perſons, in the Netherlands, for the ſupport of the War. Thus we find, not only the Engliſh affiliated ſocieties, but the German Government, imitating the French mode of raiſing the ſupplies, and it may ſoon be as dangerous for a man in Britain, as for a prieſt in France, to be without a certificate of his having made contributions of civiſm.

But, in conſidering how far our affiliated ſocieties, aſſociated for the purpoſe of protecting the Conſtitution, are themſelves deſtroying it, we ſhall find, that addreſſes are not only contrary to the ſpirit of the Conſtitution, as they preſume to ſpeak the voice of the people, which can neither legally, nor fairly be done, unleſs in the Houſe of Commons; but that thoſe ſocieties, in attempting to raiſe the ſupplies, have taken the actual, and moſt important part of the buſineſs of the Houſe of Commons into their own hands, and if they ſucceed in their deſign, will render Parliaments totally uſeleſs.

The civic contributions for flannel waiſtcoats, were firſt begun in Edinburgh, afterwards in Windſor, and then the project was taken up in London, by a perſon notoriouſly in the pay * of Government, and in the confidence



* Beſides having a ſhare in the property of the newſpaper, called the Sun, it is confidently ſaid, he is allowed 600l. per annum

of perſons *, high in office, with whom he daily communicates. A public meeting was next called, at the Crown and Anchor Tavern, where one of Mr. Reeves's committee, Mr. Devaynes, was appointed perpetual Preſident, and they reſolved themſelves into a ſociety for levying contributions of flannel waiſtcoats, and money for purchaſing them. The Common Council of the City of London, following their example, not only voted ſupplies as a body, but nominated each of their members, tax gatherers,—collectors of voluntary contributions in their reſpective ſections; and Mr. Serjeant Watſon, in St. Andrew's, Holborn, opens his budget, with a poll-tax of five ſhillings per head! It may, indeed, be ſaid, that theſe proceedings, though not ſtrictly conſtitutional, are of ſo little importance, that they do not deſerve the notice of Government; that the ſums or clothes collected are ſo trifling, compared with the neceſſities of the ſtate, that they never can ſuperſede the buſineſs of Parliament in granting the ſupplies: But we ſhall find, that it is not the fault of theſe ſocieties, if their proceedings are not carried to the moſt dangerous lengths: for, although they began with flannel waiſtcoats, we find ſucceſs has induced them to paſs to the providing of mitts, drawers, caps, ſhirts, Welch-wigs, ſtockings, ſhoes, trowſers, boots, ſheets, great coats, gowns, petticoats, blankets,

annum for conducting that paper, and the True Briton, the latter of which is as confidently ſaid, to be the property of perſons in office.

* Mr. Long, under Secretary to the Treaſury, and Mr. Burgeſs, under Secretary to the foreign department.

kets, &c. &c. From clothing the army, they have begun to victual them. A ſchoolmaſter, in the True Briton, recommends ſplit-peas, as good for their health, and, therefore, fit to be provided by the affiliated ſocieties. From the army, they have proceeded to clothe the navy, and at laſt, tired of going ſlowly on from one ſtep to another, they expreſs their wiſh of raiſing the whole expences of the State, and thereby not only ſuperſeding the uſe of Parliaments, but of financial Miniſters; not only of taking the buſineſs of the Houſe of Commons into their hands, but of taking the buſineſs of the Chancellor of the Exchequer alſo! Mr. Chairman Bligh, and his affiliated ſociety, in Chelſea *, declare their opinion to be, "that in "conſequence of the public ſpirit diſplayed in "ſubſcribing for extra clothing to the army, "*and confirmed of the value of our excellent* "*Conſtitution*, they ſuggeſt that the whole "expences of the War might be defrayed in "the ſame manner; and, that in proſecuting "the War, they earneſtly wiſh that the Mini-"ſter, whoſe office it is to find ways and "means for raiſing the ſupplies, could be re-"lieved from the political neceſſity of impoſing "taxes on the people." Thus they would relieve the Miniſter, and the Houſe of Commons, from raiſing taxes, to take the buſineſs into their own hands! A propoſition more hoſtile to the Conſtitution, and government of this coun-

* See the Advertiſement, containing the Reſolutions of this ſociety, ſigned J. Bligh, dated from the King's Arms, Five Fields, Chelſea, and publiſhed in the Sun, on Saturday, Nov. 30. 1793.

try, than the imputed offences for which Meſſrs. Muir and Palmer, are ſentenced to be tranſported. Yet, the editor of the Sun, in a note to a correſpondent, about the ſame time, remarks, not that ſuch a plan is contrary to the laws of the land, but that he is afraid it would not be *ſufficiently* productive!

The Hiſtory of this Country will juſtify me in aſſerting, that theſe proceedings are highly unconſtitutional. Benevolences, or voluntary contributions, which at firſt were free, were afterwards made compulſory, and were carried to ſuch an extent, that the act paſſed in the firſt of Richard the IIId. "Damning and annulling "for ever that mode of raiſing money," affirms, that theſe benevolences had been the ruin of many families, by obliging them to ſell off their houſehold goods, and reducing them to beggary, &c. The attempt to raiſe forced benevolences, in a great degree, brought Charles the Iſt. to the ſcaffold, and ſo ſenſible was his ſucceſſor, Charles the IId. of this, and the danger of at all raiſing money in that manner, that, in the ſecond year after his reſtoration, and in the zenith of his popularity, he did not preſume to do what a hired agent of Government, an editor of a newſpaper, now takes upon him to put in practice; for we find, that in 1661, an act was paſſed "to impower the King to receive "from his ſubjects a *free* and *voluntary contri-* "*bution*, for his preſent occaſions *," and the words of the act itſelf, not only expreſsly declare, that it ſhall not be drawn into example

* See Rapin's Hiſtory of England, vol. 2, p. 626.

for

for the future, but that *no aids of that nature*, can be iſſued or *levied*, but by conſent of Parliament *.

Now, the greateſt want of Charles the IId. was money to eſtabliſh a ſtanding army, and as the preſent "free and voluntary contributions" are alſo for the army, the object to which the ſums raiſed are applied, is, in a certain degree, the ſame: At any rate, King Charles the IId's occaſions for money could only be the general occaſions of the Government, ſuch as maintaining the army and navy, &c. and, therefore, the purpoſes for which the free and voluntary contributions were ſubſcribed to him, and the purpoſes for which thoſe are now ſubſcribed to Mr. Devaynes, are generally the ſame. The act, ſays, that no aids of *that nature*, ſhall be levied without the conſent of Parliament, and as I conceive, that a "*Free and voluntary preſent*," whether paid into the hands of an Alderman, Common Councilman, a member of Mr. Reeves's committee, or an editor of a newſpaper,—or whether paid into the hands of agents, officially named by the King, as was done by Charles the IId. while it is paid generally for the uſe of Government, to be preciſely the ſame; as I conceive, all of that kind, to be ſtill "Free and voluntary preſents," collected from the people for the *ſame purpoſe*,

* The Title of the Bill is, *An Act for a free and voluntary Preſent to his Majeſty.*

"And be it hereby declared, that no commiſſion or "aids of this nature can be iſſued out, or levied, but by con-"ſent of Parliament; and, that this act, and the ſupply "hereby granted, ſhall not be drawn into example for the "time to come." (See the Statutes at large.)

and

and as the act ſays, that no aids of the *nature* of a "free and voluntary preſent," ſhall be raiſed without the conſent of Parliament, I think, I am perfectly juſtified in affirming, the manner of now raiſing them, is *illegal*. It cannot be denied, that they are preciſely of the *ſame nature* with thoſe granted to Charles the IId. and there are the words of an act of the legiſlature, ſtating, that they cannot be levied but by the conſent of Parliament. The preſent collectors of theſe aids can produce no authority for their conduct; and if the Houſe of Commons were as tenacious of its privileges on this ſubject, as it has ſhewn itſelf on the ſubject of petitions for Reform, the meaſures it would purſue with reſpect to theſe collectors of voluntary contributions, are obvious.

It is not only by the words of an act of Parliament, that we aſcertain theſe voluntary contributions to be unconſtitutional, but a principal member of adminiſtration, the Preſident of his Majeſty's Council, and a great lawyer, the Earl of Camden, gave it as his opinion, in the Houſe of Lords, during the American War, that they were highly ſo: Mr. Dunning, and many other eminent characters, not only agreed with his Lordſhip, but ſtrongly reprobated ſuch a mode of raiſing money for the public uſe. At that time, it was the faſhion to ſubſcribe for raiſing regiments and building ſhips *, and when our preſent affiliated ſocieties

* The Earl of Londſdale engaged to build a ſeventy-four gun ſhip, at his own expence, but his ſincere attachment to the Conſtitution, which he ſaw muſt have been violated, had he fulfilled his promiſe, made him decline ſo unconſtitutional a meaſure.

ſub-

ſubſcribe for the ſame purpoſes, which probably they ſoon will, they only then will have to pay the civil liſt, which their loyalty will induce them readily to do, and then bribery and corruption, at elections, may be prevented by never calling Parliament together, as there will be no occaſion for its meeting.

I ſhall not dwell on the reproach which theſe contributions throw on government, whoſe more immediate duty it is to provide, not only neceſſary, but comfortable clothing to the army, than to give immenſe ſubſidies to Italian and German Princes, or to laviſh rewards on the Alarmiſts; and who cannot excuſe themſelves by ſaying, either the Parliament, or public, would not conſent to pay the money: nor ſhall I dwell on the ſtill greater impropriety, to give it no worſe a name, of the members of adminiſtration, giving encouragement, through their agent, the editor, to ſo unconſtitutional a meaſure. Its introduction is of recent date, and, I think, it ought inſtantly to be ſtopped, becauſe, among other inconveniences ariſing from it, a very important one is, that three times the quantity of particular articles is provided, to that which is wanted, while, of other articles, not a third is ſubſcribed. This is evident at preſent. Of flannel waiſtcoats, a ſufficient number have already been contributed to give every ſoldier half a dozen, while the number of ſhoes would not afford them half a pair a-piece. Thus the public money is waſted, and the Conſtitution deſtroyed, by thoſe who profeſſedly aſſociate to defend it. Parliament is the moſt proper monitor

of,

of government; and a Houſe of Commons, freely and frequently choſen, by a majority of the people, is the only conſtitutional channel, through which, to levy money, for the public uſe; becauſe, in ſuch a Houſe of Commons, the voice of the people would be truly and calmly heard. On the contrary, addreſſes and aſſociations, either for expreſſing their opinion on public affairs, or raiſing ſupplies for the State, are particularly dangerous, as the government pretends to be guided by the ſentiments conveyed in them, though they admit of hearing only one ſide of the queſtion, and may often be adopted to give an appearance of popularity to very unpopular meaſures, thereby deceiving the King, breeding diſaffection in the people, and leading the one or other, or perhaps both, to ruin. Addreſſes and aſſociations, therefore, ſhould be diſcouraged, as deluſive, and a Reformed Houſe of Commons be ſubſtituted in their ſtead, where the will of the nation might be fairly and peaceably aſcertained.

Theſe are, I think, ſufficient reaſons to ſhew the neceſſity of reforming the Repreſentation in this country. If we enquire how far it can be conſtitutionally done, we ſhall find, that the ancient ſpirit, and principles, and "*practice*," of the Conſtitution recognized *all men of conſideration in the State*, as having a right to be preſent in the King's Councils. At the conqueſt, indeed, and for ſome time afterwards, men of landed property were the only perſons of conſideration in the kingdom; and accordingly we find, in the reign of Henry the IIId, in the firſt Houſe of Commons of which we

have

have any account of thoſe who compoſed it, that it conſiſted *only* of four Knights from each county, who of courſe repreſented *landed* proprietors alone. The principles and "practice" of the Conſtitution, however, being, that *all men of conſideration*, who, conſequently would be called on for pecuniary aid, ſhould be preſent in the King's Councils, and trade beginning to ſhew itſelf, Citizens and Burgeſſes were ſummoned from ſuch towns as were growing into importance. And herein conſiſted the great excellence of the Engliſh Conſtitution: it adapted itſelf to all ſituations, it opened its arms to all men of property as perſons more particularly intereſted in the government of the country, and therefore entitled to a ſhare in the Legiſlative Aſſembly. But what an extraordinary deviation from the principle and practice do we now find? The men of the leaſt conſideration, a few of the pooreſt beggars in the kingdom, create the majority of our Legiſlators; while the men of moſt conſideration, of moſt utility to the State, the merchants and manufacturers, are generally excluded. Conſtruct the Houſe of Commons, according to the ancient principles and practice of the Conſtitution, as manifeſted by the admiſſion of Citizens and Burgeſſes to the National Councils; give every man, and none but men of property, a vote for Members of Parliament, and I am ſatisfied.

Mr. Young (p. 223.) gives the authority of Dr. Brady, to ſhew, that in ancient times, *liberi homines*, or free men, were only thoſe who held in *capite*; and, throughout his whole book, he maintains, that landed proprietors were the only

reemen, and that they all had a right to vote for Repreſentatives; that the other inhabitants were of no more account in the kingdom than the cows, ſheep, and hogs, they drove; the artizans, manufacturers, labourers, &c. were all ſlaves and villains, and the privilege of ſending Repreſentatives, was a gracious donation from the King,—not a right of thoſe to whom it was given; and in ſupport of this he proves, that ſeveral Monarchs called Members to Parliament from obſcure places. I have already ſhewn, that it was their right, according to the ſpirit and practice of the Conſtitution, which admitted all perſons of conſideration to ſend Repreſentatives; and, it no more eſtabliſhes the right of the Crown to beſtow the privilege where it pleaſed, becauſe it did ſo, than any other improper act eſtabliſhes a right to do ſo. The ſelection of the towns as they grew into importance, being entruſted to the Crown, was, like many other duties, abuſed by Kings, who, apprehenſive of being in a minority in the Commons, ſummoned members from ſuch places as they, or their creatures could command; a deſire to ſecure, or bring into office, ſome abject favourite miniſter, probably gave moſt of our rotten boroughs a right to ſend Repreſentatives. Some of our former Sovereigns, unconſtitutionally, made Members of Parliament from ſimilar motives, with thoſe which induced his preſent Majeſty, conſtitutionally, to make ſo many Peers, in 1784:—to ſecure Mr. Pitt in power.

The aſſertion, reſpecting tenants in *capite*, when properly examined, is more deſtructive to Mr. Young's object, than any other poſition in



his

his book: For, admitting what he ſays to be true, which, I believe it pretty nearly is, that none were freemen, but proprietors of land holding in *capite*, i. e. freeholders; and that all freeholders, or freemen, had a right to vote in the election of Members of Parliament, it follows, that it is either a mockery to call the Engliſh a "*free* people," "a *free nation*," as he does (vide the note, p. 205) or an injuſtice, to withhold from them that right. He affirms, that formerly our mechanics, labourers, and manufactures, &c. were all ſlaves and villains,—that they were of no more importance than cows and hogs;—admitted. But if they were ſlaves, were they free? The queſtion muſt excite a ſmile.—They were ſlaves;—and if we are ſlaves alſo, then we have no right, upon the ancient principles of the Conſtitution, as laid down by Mr. Young, to petition for Reform.—But where is the man, who dare come forward, and openly tell us, we are ſlaves? What would be his fate?—What would be the indignation of every honeſt Engliſhman? Reeves and Young have indirectly told us this, but they have not had the audacity to ſpeak roundly out. The fact is, that the preſent freedom of England was gradually extorted, ſword in hand, from feudal ſovereigns, deriving their rights from the ſword of a conqueror; nobly extorted. But had not the ſlaves and villains the greateſt ſhare in extorting it? And ſhall they who cemented it with their blood, be deprived of all his benefits? While we are attempting to make freemen of the blacks in the Weſt-Indies, ſhall we meanly ſuf-

fer

fer to be proved ſlaves ourſelves? If it is true, as Mr. Young aſſerts, that in former times, none were freemen but freeholders, and that all freeholders, or tenants in capite, were inveſted with the elective franchiſe, then it follows, that all freemen had a right to vote: If ſix hundred years ago the majority were ſlaves, are we not now all called freemen? Is not the Negro, who, ſixty years ago, was a ſlave in this country, called a freeman? And if every freeman had formerly a right to vote for Repreſentatives in Parliament, they who are now deprived of it, are, in that reſpect, ſtill ſlaves and villains. But our anceſtors ſtruggled for, and bequeathed us freedom, though not perfect freedom: The elective franchiſe was the principal article that eſcaped them, and they overlooked it, becauſe, it was not then of ſo much importance, nor was it ſo much abuſed as at preſent; they left to us the honour of atchieving it. Have we not equal virtue and perſeverance? Shall we not imitate their example? I am much ſurpriſed that Mr. Young, in deſcribing the Conſtitution, did not diſcover and recommend a mode of conſtructing the Houſe of Commons, which would be highly ſatisfactory to Government, which ſtrongly reſembles *his* theory of the ancient Parliaments, and is not quite unknown in the modern. As he aſſerts, that formerly none but tenants in capite, who held lands immediately of the Crown, had a right to ſit in Parliament, or vote at elections, it might have occurred to him, that the ancient principles of the Conſtitution would be revived, if, inſtead of the right of election, and ſitting in the Houſe of Commons,

mons, being confined to thoſe who held *lands* of the Crown, it were given to thoſe who held *places*. Upon this plan of Reform, moſt of the Crown and Anchor committee, and even Mr. Young himſelf, would be entitled to a ſeat in Parliament.

" Hiſtorians are agreed as to the Parliament " of 1265, ſummoned by an uſurper, being the " origin of the Houſe of Commons," (p. 75.) But (p. 216) Mr. Young, contradicts this; he there quotes Sir Henry Spelman, and others, to ſhew, that in an hundred Parliaments *before* that period, the *boroughs* never were repreſented; implying thereby, that there *were* Knights of the Shire, though no Citizens and Burgeſſes, which is exactly what I agree to, and ſupports what I have ſaid of the ſpirit and practice of the Conſtitution, which called to the National Council only men of conſideration in the State. It is true, that prior to 1265, and even then, cities and boroughs were not repreſented, becauſe their inhabitants were of little or no importance; the landed proprietors were the only men of importance in the kingdom, and therefore, the Houſe of Commons was compoſed wholly of their Repreſentatives. But as the cities and boroughs became of *conſideration*, they alſo ſent deputies. Nor is it juſt to conclude, (vide p. 217) becauſe, during the 200 years after the Norman conqueſt, the Houſe of Commons was ſo inſignificant as not to be mentioned by hiſtorians, that therefore, it never was aſſembled: It would be equally juſt to conclude, becauſe we have no account of the meeting of every county court, and other inſtitu-

tion

tion of leſs importance, that therefore they did not at certain times aſſemble; or, becauſe there is no hiſtory of the inhabitants in America, previous to its diſcovery by Columbus, that therefore, previous to that diſcovery, there were no inhabitants in that part of the world. And, even ſuppoſe the Houſe of Commons were never aſſembled, during the 200 years alluded to, that does not prove it to have been unknown to the Conſtitution, more than aboliſhing the Trial by Jury, in certain caſes, proves the Trial by Jury to be unknown to the Conſtitution. The exiſtence of Repreſentatives of ſome deſcription, may be traced in every page of our hiſtory, and is coeval with all law and government in England. What, although they were occaſionally laid aſide, their rights invaded, or their conſtruction varied, as ſuited the ambitious views of the Kings or Barons, that does not prove they had no right to aſſemble? On the contrary, wherever we find the ſlighteſt traces of the Houſe of Commons, or wherever we find the moſt compleat deſcription and certainty of its exiſtence and power, there is no mention of its being a *new* inſtitution, which is ſtrong proof that it was an *old* one; for is it poſſible, that ſo important a member of the Conſtitution could be created and introduced without ſome notice being taken of its novelty?

Another inſtance, not only of how far a Reform can be conſtitutionally made in the Repreſentation, but alſo of its neceſſity, is the complete change in its ſpirit and ſentiment. The Conſtitution, formerly, ſuppoſed a continual jealouſy of the Crown, and fellow feeling with

the

the people, to exiſt in the Houſe of Commons; but now, and eſpecially by Mr. Pitt, it has been made to repoſe a continual confidence in the Crown, and has ſhewn, particularly on the Ruſſian Armament, that it has no fellow feeling with the people whatever. This dangerous reverſal muſt ariſe from the reverſal of the mode of rewarding the members, which is, alſo, a great and pernicious change: for, that Mr. Young's ſalutary Corruption, did not formerly exiſt, is plain, ſince the privilege of returning members, now ſo valuable, was then rather a burthen than a benefit; was then of ſo little importance, that many boroughs petitioned to be eaſed of it. To beget a jealouſy of the Crown, and reſtore the ancient nationality of ſentiment, in the Houſe of Commons, is, therefore, not only conſtitutional, but the moſt wiſe and neceſſary meaſure, for preſerving the Freedom and Proſperity of the People.

How far it is conſtitutional to ſhorten the duration of Parliaments, does not require much inveſtigation, becauſe the facts relating to the queſtion are of recent date, and clearly underſtood. Originally, Parliaments were only called for a particular purpoſe, and often ſat only a few days: Sometimes there were two, but generally one new Parliament, in a year. In the ſeventeenth century, the uſage varied, and was moſt groſsly abuſed by the long Parliament, at laſt diſſolved by Cromwell. Yet, the vile precedent was approved, and imitated by the Kings who followed, and William the IIId. made it a great favour to agree to the Triennial Bill. The Septennial Bill is juſtified by Mr. Young, who ſays

" The

" The Members of the Houſe of Commons, when elected, and in combination with the other branches of the legiſlature, aſſume and poſſeſs, and give themſelves ſuch powers and privileges, as rendered the ſeptennial act juſt as conſtitutional as the biennial." That act, however, was by thoſe who made it, juſtified only upon the exigency of the times, and ought to have heen repealed when that exigency was paſt; but, without conſidering its legality, I ſhall remark, that, if Mr. Young's pernicious doctrine were true, there would not be the leaſt ſecurity for the Liberties of the Nation: the three branches of the Legiſlature, in combination, might aſſume a power to repeal the Habeas Corpus Act, aboliſh the Trial by Jury, and the Liberty of the Preſs; give to the King's Proclamations the force of Law, as was done in the reign of Henry the VIIIth. and veſting the whole executive and legiſlative authority in the Crown, diſſolve themſelves for ever, and annihilate at once the Conſtitution and Freedom of Britain: This, according to Mr. Young, they might *conſtitutionally* do, by *aſſuming* powers and privileges; and, indeed, he ſeems deſirous that they ſhould do it, when he ſets up as precedent, the example of Richard the IId. who dictated to the ſheriffs, the names of thoſe perſons whom they ſhould return to Parliament, and levied money without the conſent of Parliament: Richard's fate, as well as Charles the Firſt's, is well known. Were Mr. Young prime Miniſter, and his advice followed, he would probably occaſion events, which no good man can wiſh to think of.

On

On the ſubject of the TIME for making a Reform, I can ſay nothing new. "To minds "unwilling to do right, all times are equally "inconvenient and improper. To him who "diſlikes the voyage, all the winds of Heaven "are unpropitious: He looks for nothing but "pretences to avoid it*." "This, indeed, "is a never failing argument, equally in times "of proſperity and adverſity; in times of War "and Peace. If our ſituation happens to be "proſperous, it is then aſked, whether we can "be more than happy, or more than free? In "the ſeaſon of adverſity, on the other hand, all "Reform or Innovation is deprecated, from "the pretended riſk of increaſing the evil and "preſſure of our ſituation. From all this, it "would appear, that the time for Reform "never yet has come, and never can come†." "When, indeed, the arbitrary monarchy of "France, was battering down by the exertions "of a great people, and nothing was ſeen but "virtuous exertion and exultation, it might be "admitted, that in ſuch a conjuncture, men "might run before the mark, and confound "principles together, which had no connection. "Such was the alledged, but not proved ſtate "of England, when Mr. Grey gave notice "laſt year of his motion. The objection had "then, therefore, at leaſt, a *plauſible*, though "not a juſt foundation. But, good God! how "different, on the admiſſion of the objectors "to the times, was the preſent moment?" the

* Vide Mr. Francis's ſpeech, May 7th.
† Vide Mr. Grey's ſpeech, May 6th.

Engliſh " Starting back with horror at the " crimes and calamities of France, and ſeem- " ingly forgetting all diſtreſſes in an enthuſiaſm " for their own Government! Surely com- " mon ſenſe pronounced that to be the hour " for reformation, more eſpecially when it was " left to themſelves (the Houſe of Commons) " to originate and to faſhion it. So far from " being urged on by the people to go too far, " they trod like men that feared the ground " would break under them, and could hardly " be brought up to the point which their un- " derſtandings dictated. Let them ſeize, there- " fore, this happy and providential criſis, to do " with popularity and ſafety, what to ſave their " country muſt be done at laſt*." But, inſtead of embracing this favourable opportunity, every means is employed by Government to defeat the cauſe of Reform, and calumniate its advocates; and the preſent mode of conſtructing the Houſe of Commons, will, probably, be continued until ſome dreadful convulſion happens, which may threaten the annihilation of the Conſtitution itſelf.

In conſidering what Reform ſhould be made, I ſhall neither recommend nor reject any particular plan, being perfectly of opinion with Mr. Grey, that, to conſtitute the Houſe of Commons by univerſal ſuffrage, or any other mode, which would make it more independent than at preſent, would be a moſt ſalutary improvement. Mr. Young ſays, the Society of the Friends of the People, approve perſonal Repre-

* Mr. Erſkine's ſpeech, May 6th.

ſentation;

ſentation; but I cannot diſcover, except in his interpretations, that they ever have either approved or condemned it, or any other rule of Reform. Inſtead, therefore, of enquiring what their plan may be, will it not be more in point to examine that propoſed by the moſt violent leader of the moſt violent ſociety in Britain? —For ſuch, I believe, Mr. Horne Tooke, and the conſtitutional ſociety, are deemed by Mr. Young, and thoſe who think with him.

Mr. Horne Tooke, in his letter to Lord Aſhburton, when he, and Mr. Pitt, Sir James Sanderſon, Mr. Froſt, and the Duke of Richmond, were joint Reformers, ſo far from approving univerſal ſuffrage, recommends a plan of Reform, perfectly agreeing with the ideas of thoſe gentlemen, who ſay, the Houſe of Commons is a Repreſentation of Property for he makes it the governing power in electing the Repreſentatives of the people. He maintains, that although all men may have a right to a ſhare, yet they have not all a right to an *equal* ſhare in this choice; for, ſays he, "There is "a very great difference between an *equal* "*right* to a ſhare, and a right to an *equal* "*ſhare*. An eſtate may deviſed, by will, among "many perſons, in different proportions; to "one five pounds, to another five hun-"dred, &c. each perſon will have an equal "right to his ſhare, but not a right to an equal "ſhare."

"This principle," (continues Mr. Tooke, alluding to univerſal ſuffrage) "is further at-"tempted to be enforced by an aſſertion, that "*the all of one man is as dear to him, as the*

" *all of another man is to that other.* But " this maxim will not hold by any means; for " a ſmall is not, for very good reaſons, ſo dear " as a great all. A ſmall all may be loſt, and " very eaſily regained; it may very often, and " with great wiſdom, be riſked for the chance " of a greater; it may be ſo ſmall, as to " be little or not at all worth defending or " caring for. But a large all can never be re- " covered; it has been maſſing and accumu- " lating, perhaps, from father to ſon, for many " generations; or it has been the product " of a long life of induſtry and talents; " or the conſequence of ſome circumſtance " which will never return. Juſtice and " policy require, that benefit and burthen, " that the ſhare of power, and the ſhare of " contribution to that power, ſhould be as " nearly proportioned as poſſible." Thus far Mr. Tooke ſpeaks againſt the *equality of right* to a ſhare in the Repreſentation: He then ſpeaks of the impolicy of making the elective franchiſe *univerſal.* " Freedom and ſecurity " ought ſurely to be equal and univerſal," (ſays he) " but the members of a ſociety may be *free* " and *ſecure*, without having a ſhare in the " Government. *The happineſs and freedom,* " *and ſecurity of the whole, may even be ad-* " *vanced by the* EXCLUSION *of* SOME, *not from* " *freedom and ſecurity, but from a ſhare in* " *the Government.*" Mr. Tooke then enu- merates the claſſes which ought to be excluded, and which certainly are the majority, as they comprise " the extremely miſerable," " ex- " tremely

" tremely dependent," " extremely ignorant," and " extremely ſelfiſh."

His plan of conſtructing the Houſe of Commons is, that the kingdom ſhould be divided into 513 diſtricts, each of which ſhould ſend a member: that none ſhould vote who were not aſſeſſed in two pounds to the pariſh rates, or land tax; that Parliaments ſhould be annual; that every elector at the time of giving his vote, ſhould pay two guineas, to be appropriated to the uſe of the nation; and, that where the number of electors fell ſhort of 4000, thoſe might vote over again, in proportion as they were aſſeſſed, and repeat their vote as often as was neceſſary to compleat the number of 4000, ſtill paying two guineas for each vote. By this plan, a landholder, paying a large land-tax, might probably, have the privilege of giving one hundred votes, upon paying two hundred guineas. What plan would give the predominating influence in the choice of Repreſentatives, more compleatly into the hands of men of property than this? According to it, property would be *truly* repreſented, becauſe none but men of *ſome* property are aſſeſſed to the amount of two pounds to the pariſh rates, or land-tax: And even if univerſal ſuffrage were eſtabliſhed, yet the circumſtance of paying annually two guineas, for the privilege of voting, would effectually exclude the majority, who are poor, and would ſtill give the ruling influence in elections to men of property.

Such is the Reform propoſed by Mr. Horne Tooke, a leader, if not *the* leader, of a ſociety which Mr. Young deſcribes to be much more violent

violent than the Friends of the People; and, if that ſociety are called more dangerous than the latter, and yet it appears, the object of their leader is ſo moderate, it is ſurely unneceſſary to vindicate the Friends of the People from the charge of entertaining miſchievous views, ſince Mr. Young admits them to be more moderate than the conſtitutional ſociety. I here think it neceſſary to remark, that the epithet, violent, applied to the conſtitutional ſociety, is merely Mr. Young's, not mine.

Compare Mr. Tooke's plan of Reform with that propoſed by a principal conductor of the preſent War, and conſequently a partizan and favourite of Mr. Young, I mean the Duke of Richmond. His Grace contended for perſonal Repreſentation in its *fulleſt extent*, and his co-adjutors * were Mr. Pitt, Lord Kenyon, and the leaders of the preſent Adminiſtration; yet it is ſtrange, that the Duke and his friends, who firſt recommended perſonal Repreſentation, and who truly have founded the ſocieties in favour of that meaſure, and the petitions which lately prayed for it, eſcape the cenſure of thoſe who aſcribe every miſchief to their doctrine; and it is ſtill more ſtrange that ſuch as Mr. Tooke, who are *decidedly againſt* perſonal Repreſentation, ſhould be loaded with obloquy!

From what I have ſtated, therefore, it appears, that Mr. Tooke's plan agrees with the ancient ſpirit and practice of the Conſtitution,

* I do not mean to ſay, that Mr. Pitt, Lord Kenyon, &c. contended for univerſal ſuffrage, but as they acted cordially with thoſe who did they are equally guilty, according to Mr. Young's reaſoning.

which

which recognized only *men of conſideration in the State* as having a right to a ſhare in the great National Council; and that the Duke of Richmond's plan agrees perfectly with Mr. Young's original Theory of the Conſtitution, which gave every freeman a right to vote, and conſequently, now, muſt make the elective franchiſe univerſal, ſince there are no ſlaves, but all are freemen in Britain.

For my own part, I think, the true object of a Reform is, not to give every man his natural right of a vote, but to make the Houſe of Commons independent of the executive power, or of a ſmall number of wealthy men, and to make it act upon an identity of intereſt with the people. The manner in which this would be beſt accompliſhed, would, in my opinion, be the rule of a Reform. Mr. Fox ſaid truly, that the object of a Reform of Parliament ought to be the collection of the greateſt number, not ſimply of wills, but of *independent* wills: and Monteſquieu was of the ſame opinion; for, in ſpeaking of the Britiſh Conſtitution, he ſays, it is neceſſary in a free Government that every man ſhould have a ſuffrage who can be ſuppoſed to have *a will of his own*. I therefore agree with Mr. Tooke, that the happineſs of the whole may be advanced by the excluſion of ſome, not from happineſs, but from the elective franchiſe, becauſe, a great manufacturer or landholder, or any other perſon, who employed, or could control, the extremely miſerable, extremely dependent, or extremely ignorant, might influence them to vote as he pleaſed, and thereby acquire an undue power in

elections,

elections, and invade the independence of the Legiſlature; for I conceive, that, univerſal ſuffrage, would render the miſerable and ſelfiſh electors liable to be corrupted, the ignorant liable to be miſled, and the dependent liable to be commanded. Theſe claſſes would generally, if not always, form the majority at elections, and conſequently, thoſe candidates who poſſeſſed wealth, eloquence, or control, might procure themſelves to be returned, although their conduct in Parliament had previouſly been injurious to the national welfare, and even diſpleaſing to the independent national judgment.

It is aſked, by Mr. Young, as the journeymen mechanicks, manufacturers, and labourers, never voted at elections, what right have they to petition for Reform; and they themſelves may join in ſaying, if, according to Mr. Tooke's plan, we are not to vote, why, indeed, ſhould we petition for Reform? To this, I anſwer, it is as much their intereſt to make exertions in favour of Reform, as it is the intereſt of thoſe who would be veſted with the elective franchiſe, which is, in itſelf, of no value to thoſe who poſſeſs it, but like the delegation, ought to be entruſted to thoſe who would exerciſe it with the moſt wiſdom and independence; and as wiſdom and independence prevail more certainly in the middling ranks, than in the whole maſs of the people, the elective franchiſe, ſhould, in my opinion, be confined to them; and I repeat, that it is as much the intereſt of thoſe who would not, as of thoſe who would have votes, that a Reform ſhould take place, and even that the elective franchiſe

chiſe ſhould be ſo confined, becauſe the benefits that would flow from a Repreſentative body ſo conſtructed, would be general, and the poor, as well as the rich, would equally partake of them.

If, indeed, men were to be guided wholly by natural right, and fully to inſiſt upon the maxim, that no man is bound by laws to which he has not given conſent, it would come to this, that all men in the kingdom muſt aſſemble perſonally to form the Legiſlative Aſſembly; and this was pretty nearly the caſe in ancient times. But the ſyſtem of delegation was adopted, not only for the ſake of convenience, but becauſe, the wiſeſt and moſt independent men, in whom the whole maſs could confide, were appointed to make laws, and by the ſmallneſs of their number, were enabled to act with deliberation and ſound judgment. If, therefore, the ancient great National Council was thus narrowed, for the ſake of convenience, wiſdom, and independence, why ſhould not the conſtruction of the modern National Council be alſo, either narrowed or extended, to thoſe limits which are moſt likely to inſure convenience, wiſdom, independence, and impartiality? If the right is ſurrendered, in one inſtance, to procure certain objects, why ſhould it not be ſurrendered in another, if by that other ſurrender thoſe objects are more firmly ſecured?

This will be further illuſtrated by the Trial by Jury. The privilege of ſerving on Juries, which certainly is of a more clear and immediate value, than a vote for a Repreſentative, is not univerſal, but is confined to houſeholders

and landholders, yet it is as much the natural right of every man as the elective franchiſe. And what is the reaſon we never heard of petitions and aſſociations for extending to all men the privilege of ſerving on Juries? Becauſe all men are ſatisfied, that by the principle, it is ſufficiently diſtributed, (however, it may be ſecretly abuſed in practice,) to render Juries indedendent and impartial; and becauſe, the poor labourer, or mechanic, although he knows he can never ſerve on a Jury, while he is neither a houſekeeper nor a landholder, is, nevertheleſs, convinced that juſtice is as amply ſecured by thoſe who do ſerve, as if the privilege were univerſal, and therefore, he does not aſſociate or petition to extend it; yet he is as much intereſted in preſerving it to houſeholders and landholders, as if he himſelf were a houſeholder or landholder; and if the elective franchiſe were as generally diſtributed, as the privilege of ſerving on Juries, we ſhould neither have aſſociations of the rich or the poor, for reforming Parliament.

But while I agree in opinion with Mr. Tooke, that the middling claſs of ſociety, ſhould elect the Members of Parliament, I am far from agreeing with him in the mode of election. There ſhould be no ſuch condition as that of paying two guineas at the time of voting, nor ſhould any man be permitted to vote more than once.

From what I have now ſaid, I think, a Reform is neceſſary; that the elective franchiſe ſhould either be given *excluſively* to men of conſideration, or univerſally to *all men*, (for,

to

to me, it is immaterial, whether it is poſſeſſed by all, or a part, if the Repreſentative Body is independent;) that the preſent time is peculiarly favourable for making a Reform; that Parliaments ought to be annual, and that the Repreſentatives ought to be liberally paid by their Conſtituents for their attendance. The means of preventing riots and corruption at elections, and making many other inferior regulations, are ſimple and obvious.

Nor are we to dread innovation, for, while he deprecates the deſtruction of "extravagant "Courts, ſelfiſh Miniſters, and corrupt Majo-"rities." Mr. Young ſays, that "to declare "againſt any meaſure, becauſe, an innovation "is a conduct worthy of children. It is not "for or againſt innovation, but what the na-"ture of the innovation ſhall be." Admitting then, the removal of corruption by Reform, to be an innovation, is it not a more laudable one than that which Mr. Young adviſes, the eſtabliſhment of a national militia of property? He cautions againſt taking away from the machine of Government, a rotten wheel, which all men, not excepting himſelf, have directly or indirectly condemned, and yet deſires the addition of a new one, which no man of eminence, has either approved or thought of. But he may be aſſured, his advice will not be followed by Government. The Crown will never part with the control over the military. During the American War, it found the conſequences of putting arms into the hands of the people in Ireland, and although, men of property proſtrate themſelves before the Throne at

preſent, yet it is obvious, they will not always continue in the ſame humour, becauſe, their property marks them out as the prey of taxation, and when their ridiculous fears are over, they will regard Government with a jealous eye; and if armed and diſciplined, might probably make both Reforms and Revolutions; might deſtroy ſelfiſh Miniſters, and root out Corruption. Men of property are not only more intelligent, but more intereſted in the government of this country, than men of no property, and therefore are more likely to interfere in its conduct, and thwart its favourite meaſures. It is not from an opinion of the wiſdom of our rulers, that the rich at preſent ſupport them, but from a dread inſidiouſly excited, that their property is in danger from the deſigns of thoſe who oppoſe the Government. When this unfounded dread is paſt, they will be equally diſpleaſed with "extravagant Courts, ſelfiſh Miniſters, and corrupt Majorities," for invading their property as they now are, with the Friends to Liberty, from a miſtaken notion that they meditate its deſtruction. The ſame motive, which now makes them afraid to innovate, (the preſervation of property) will, hereafter, make them clamorous for political œconomy,—for Reform. Government knows this well, and therefore, it will depend for ſupport on the "Slaves and villains," on the "Beggars without a ſhilling," rather than on the opulent, who ſoon might be diſpoſed to make elections for Members of Parliament, and dictate to Government, "at the point of the bayonet." If then, the Houſe of Commons, is at all a good

inſtitution,

inſtitution, and an evil does exiſt in it, are we not to aſcribe the birth of that evil to the deviation from its principles, profeſſions, and original practice? And how ſhall we expel the evil but by bringing it nearer to theſe?—This is Reform; and the moment we deviate from it, a dread of innovation becomes juſtifiable, leſt it may be carried too far. But no ſuch dread can reaſonably be entertained while improvement is confined to the original practice, the principles, and preſent profeſſions of the Houſe of Commons, becauſe a limit is marked out, beyond which it is impoſſible for Parliamentary *Reform* to go.

Mr. Young ſays (p. 81), that the people never had the power of changing the Conſtitution without being in its perpetual exerciſe. This is like his other abſurdities; for it is plain the people *always* have the *Power*, though not always the *right*; and the "Practice" ſhews the fallacy of what he would inculcate, that if they began Reform they would always be altering. "People are not ſo eaſily got out of their "old forms as ſome are apt to ſuggeſt. They "are hardly to be prevailed with to amend "the acknowledged faults in the frame of Go-"vernment they have been accuſtomed to. "And if there be any original defects, or ad-"ventitious ones introduced by time or cor-"ruption, it is not an eaſy thing to get them "changed, even when all the world ſees there "is an opportunity for it *." The hiſtory of all countries, particularly of this, ſhews, that

* Locke's Eſſay on Government,

the

the people are never eager to change their form of Government. A memorable and recent inſtance of this is on record. At the concluſion of the American War, the whole blame of which was thrown on the Corruption of the Houſe of Commons, and when as many approved of Reform as at this time dread it, ſo fearful were the people of forcing Government, or ſo little inclined to interfere, that there were not ſo many ſignatures affixed to the petitions, praying Parliamentary Reform, as there were laſt ſpring. If the people are naturally fickle, why did they not come forward on that occaſion? The fact is quite the contrary to what Mr. Young affirms, and juſt as Mr. Locke ſtates it. Hiſtory ſhews us, that Governors have generally, if not always, altered Governments for the worſe, and that the people have always altered them for the better. I except the caſe of France, the experiment having neither had time nor opportunity to be made there; and indeed Mr. Young acknowledges, that the important tranſactions in that unhappy country have been effected, not by the people, but by the *terror* produced by a very *ſmall minority*.

I have declined pointing out any of the abuſes in the preſent mode of conducting elections, or ſhewing the abſurd manner in which the elective franchiſe is diſtributed, becauſe theſe ſubjects, and ſeveral others, are ſo ably treated in the Petition and Reports of the Friends of the People; nor do I think it neceſſary to reply to all Mr. Young's ridiculous animadverſions on thoſe publications. He ſays (p 84.), "You

" You ſtate the Parliamentary Influence of the " Earl of Lonſdale, Lords Eliott, Edgecumbe, " &c. you ſtate a fact; but (p. 81.) with " this ſyſtem of influence, which ſeems Cor- " ruption to the eye of ignorance, the liberties " the people have been conſtantly improving; " —we are happy under the Government of " Influence, how then can it be bad?"—He might juſt as well ſay, " You ſtate the crimes of Barrington, Hubbard, and other highway-men; you ſtate a fact;—but with their ſyſtem of livelihood, which ſeems robbery in the eye of ignorance, the liberties of the people have been conſtantly improving. We are happy, though contributions are made on Hounſlow-Heath, how then can they be bad?" Corruption, as I have already ſaid, is a bad part of a good ſyſtem, and ought to be removed. And, though I by no means blame, or allude to the Noblemen above-mentioned, yet, I have no doubt, that tranſactions take place relative to Parliamentary Influence, which I, being an ignorant perſon, deem Corruption, that not only deſerve, but if publicly proved, would, for the ſake of decency, be as rigorouſly puniſhed as any offence committed on Hounſlow-Heath *.

* I will not, however, be too poſitive in this remark, for I was preſent when a very rich man of the name of Smith was, on the teſtimony of ſeveral others, committed for groſs perjury, by a Comm ttee which was trying a conteſted election for Exeter in 1791, before which he had been examined as a witneſs. I ſoon afterwards ſaw, by the Newgate Calender, that he was impriſoned by virtue of the Speaker's warrant, to take his trial at the Old-Bailey for perjury. But by ſome means, which I could never learn, perhaps by Mr. Young's ſalutary influence, he was ſpeedily brought before the Houſe, reprimanded, and diſcharged; nor, although it was then hinted, that he was yet to be puniſhed, has any puniſhment been inflicted!!!

And we might, with equal juſtice aſcribe, our happineſs to the robberies committed there, as to the influence, which, according to Mr. Young, the ignorant think Corruption in the Houſe of Commons.

But this boaſted happineſs is, I fear, much over-coloured. Thoſe who can buy a three-and-ſixpenny pamphlet indeed, the ſhopkeepers and merchants of the City of London, the members of country corporations, and all who poſſeſs the means of living eaſily, may well ſay, they are happy; but they ſhould not take upon them to anſwer for the whole nation *. Do theſe men compriſe the whole people? No. Not a tenth, perhaps not a fiftieth part of the people. Yet, as they are more intelligent, conſpicuous, buſy, and noiſy, in the world, they certainly make a great appearance. My unfaſhionable idea of *the people*, however, compriſes the Swiniſh Multitude, as well as the men of ſome property.

I ſhall not enter into an abſtract definition of happineſs. If it is preſumed, that acquieſcence in a ſtate is a proof of its happineſs, then the Turks and Tartars, and the Weſt-India ſlaves, are happy, and it would be impolitic to improve their condition or reform the Conſtitu-

* A Farmer-General in Languedoc, who received as much money from the old French as Mr. Reeves now does from the Engliſh Government, was told many years ago, when Reform might have been made without being followed by any miſchievous conſequences, how neceſſary it was to retrench and amend the mode of carrying on the Government; to which, like our penſioners, he anſwered, *Mais pourquoi changer? Nous ſommes ſi bien.*—But why change? We are ſo well.

tions

tions under which they live. And it will be found, that what is deemed happineſs in Britain is mere ſubmiſſion, ariſing, not from an enjoyment of the comforts of life, but from the ignorance of the lower claſs of people; an ignorance, which Mr. Young recommends to be perpetuated and increaſed; and, indeed, it is a ſure way of beſtowing what ſome men mean by happineſs; for how can a man regret the want of that to which he has never been accuſtomed? Had the inhabitants of this country been always confined to ſuch happineſs, they might now have been no better off than they were under William the Conqueror, or than the preſent wretched natives of Morocco. The diffuſion of knowledge has been a chief cauſe of the ſuperior degree of happineſs enjoyed by the Britiſh ſubjects; but this happineſs cannot be interpreted to be acquieſcence, or a blind and ignorant content, becauſe then the wild ſavages of America are happier than the moſt wealthy claſſes in Britain. It muſt be interpreted, proſperity, or a ſuperior degree of enjoyment in the neceſſaries and comforts of life, and in the civilized intercourſe of ſociety. By this rule, therefore, we muſt judge of it; for otherwiſe, we ſhall find the moſt wretched beings content in the midſt of want, and the moſt wealthy and proſperous diſcontented in the midſt of plenty.

If, then, we decide on the happineſs of the people at large in Britain, not by what may chance to make them acquieſcent, but by what rationally ought to make them content, we ſhall find their happineſs to conſiſt chiefly in the

assertions of those who really possess that, and in the ignorance of those who do not. That which *ought* to give content, and consequently constitutes happiness, is, I conceive, a plenty of good food and clothing, of all the necessaries of life, to such a degree, as would make every man and his family comfortable. How far that is the case I will leave any man to judge, who can impartially, and with some intelligence on the subject, compare all classes in his neighbourhood. He must not confine himself to the Royal-Exchange, to Grosvenor-Square, or Mr. Young's parlour; but let him examine the large towns, the manufacturers, mechanics, and country labourers, and he will find an immense majority of the people, who are not so well provided with the necessaries of life, as the paupers in a work-house. Even in London, the most wealthy spot in the empire, I will venture to affirm, that a great majority are not comfortably provided with the common necessaries of life; and that if those, who are comfortably provided, are compared with those who are actually starving, I believe, the latter will outnumber the former. So much for the general happiness enjoyed by the people in this country. Mr. Young, when feasting on venison and claret, with the Committee of Pensioners, in the Crown and Anchor Tavern, might well exclaim, "Are not we a happy people?"—But were he to go into the regions of Spitalfields, where he might seat himself among many thousands who want a morsel of bread to put in their mouths, and say the same thing, he would provoke the indignation of every sensible man, and

even

even Mr. Reeves, I hope, would bluſh at his impudence *.

But,

* It is rather ſingular, that formerly the moſt pompous eulogiums were always made on our government, and happineſs, by thoſe who were violating the principles not only of freedom, but of common juſtice. The following extract from Henry's Hiſtory of Britain, p. 183 and 4, vol. vi. quarto edition, is one ſtrong inſtance of this: "The King," (Henry VIII. in 1543) "had borrowed great ſums from a "prodigious multitude of his ſubjects, of all ranks, for the "repayment of which, he had given bonds and other legal "ſecurities. The Parliament, very generouſly, made the "King a preſent of all the money he had borrowed from his "ſubjects, and declared his bonds and ſecurities to be of no "value. The King thanked his two houſes in the politeſt "terms, for their generoſity, and graciouſly accepted their "valuable preſent, while his creditors were left to condole "with one another, and, put up with their loſſes, as well "as they could. *The preamble to this iniquitous ſtatute, is one "of the moſt extravagant pieces of flattery that ever was com-"poſed.* In it they gave a *mournful deſcription* of the *con-"fuſion, poverty, diſtreſs*, and *miſery*, of ALL OTHER NA-"TIONS, and drew a very *flattering picture* of the *riches*, "*peace*, and *proſperity*, of England, *during his Grace's "reign.*"——Judge Jeffries, in the memorable trial of Lady Liſle, ſpoke thus to the jury. "Beſides, gentlemen, we cannot be "ſufficiently thankful to our God, for the mercies we enjoyed "under that bleſſed King (Charles the IId.) for, we are to "conſider, that we lived in all the affluence of peace and "plenty; *our Lives, Liberties, and Properties, inviolably were "ſecured; every man ſat ſafe under the ſhadow of his own "vine, and ate the fruit of his own labour.* And while our "neighbours ſuffered the calamities of War, we were ſur-"rounded with all the bleſſings of Peace, and ſlept ſecurely "under the government of a gracious and merciful King."——The Lord Juſtice Clerk, on the late trial of Mr. Muir, ſpoke in ſubſtance preciſely the ſame. The only material difference aroſe from his natural *averſion* to inebriety, which induced him to convert Judge Jeffries' intoxicating vine into a ſober fig-tree. He ſaid, "It requires no proof to "ſhew, that the Britiſh Conſtitution is the beſt that ever "was ſince the creation of the world, and it is not poſ-

 ſible

But, admitting the eulogiums on our happineſs to be juſt, will not their truth be the greateſt aggravation of the conduct of thoſe who pronounce them, and yet plunge us from this elevated felicity into all the miſeries of the moſt wanton calamitous War that ever afflicted Europe? In the ſame proportion as they extol our happineſs, do they increaſe their own criminality, by depriving us of it: And it is in vain to ſay, that the War was neceſſary, or, that it was provoked by the French, for though a majority of people inſiſt on theſe two points, yet a candid examination of facts, will ſhew, that they have no other foundation than the prejudices of thoſe who believe them.

I have already ſhewn, that hoſtilities were reſolved on by Auſtria, long before they were meditated by France *, who did all in her power to

"ſible to make it better: *for is not every man ſecure? Does* "*not every man reap the fruits of his own induſtry, and ſit* "*ſafely under his own fig-tree?*"

* The following extract is unqueſtionable proof of the wicked deſigns of the German Princes. It clearly eſtabliſhes what is maintained in the early part of this Pamphlet, viz. that the continental Deſpots were the aggreſſors in the preſent War. It gives reaſon to ſuſpect, that the King of France, deſigned by his flight, to put himſelf at the head of the invaders, as it ſhews, that long before his attempt to eſcape, he knew of the plot, yet concealed it; and it compleatly refutes the aſſertion in a late Pamphlet entitled, "Re-"flections on the propriety of an immediate Peace," ſaid to be written by Mr. Vanſittart, that the Convention at Pilnitz, was only formed in conſequence of the impriſonment of Lodis, and that when he was ſet at liberty, it ceaſed to exiſt, becauſe, it ſhews, that the plot againſt France, was formed when the King enjoyed more indulgence than at any other period during the Revolution, and when the new Conſtitution of France, wore the moſt auſpicious aſpect. M. Bigot de

to prevent them. And although Mr. Young aſſerts, that "this country had no right to in-"terfere in the affairs of France, previous to "the 10th of Auguſt, and that till then our "Government was rather friendly than other-"wiſe," yet it will eaſily be ſhewn, that he is quite miſtaken, unleſs he means ſuch friend-ſhip as the Duke of Brunſwick's, and that the War might, and ought to have been avoided, as the French were even more deſirous of keep-ing peace with Britain, than they had been to prevent a rupture with Auſtria.

Our Government, indeed, obſerved a ſtrict neutrality previous to the 10th of Auguſt, but

de Sainte Croix, who was Miniſter of Foreign Affairs, to Louis the XVIth. at the time that Monarch was dethroned, and who is now an emigrant in London, has, ſince his arri-val here, publiſhed a Hiſtory of the Conſpiracy of the 10th of Auguſt, in which he ſays, p. 152, "Dês le *Printems* de "1791, le Roi empêchoit l'execution d'un plan ſecret arrêté "a Mantoue pour attaquer, deux mois après la France, dont "les armées etoient alors incomplettes, et les frontiéres ſans "défenſe."

"In the ſpring of 1791, the King prevented the execution "of a ſecret plan, determined on at Mantua, for attacking "France, two months afterwards, the armies of which "were then incomplete, and the frontiers defenceleſs."

This gentleman's authority is of the higheſt nature. He now avows himſelf always to have been a determined Roy-aliſt. With a laudable love of his King, however, he thought he could moſt ſincerely ſerve him by diſguiſing his ſentiments, and remaining about his perſon, which he did as long as it was ſafe to do ſo. He was a particular confident of Louis the XVIth. and he now abuſes the Conſtitution of 1789. But what is ſtronger proof of his being a Royaliſt, and a confident of his late King, is, that he is admitted to St. James's, and careſſed by our Government; and, even the well known Peltier, in his Dernier Tableau de Paris, calls him "le veritable homme du Roi."

not

not from any good will towards France. It was the dread of the reſentment of the Britiſh people, and the belief, that the Duke of Brunſwick would effect his purpoſe without our aſſiſtance, that prevented Adminiſtration from openly joining the concert of Princes in their firſt operations. Sufficient proof of this was on record before the 10th of Auguſt, and ſubſequent events have ſet the fact beyond all diſpute. The hoſtile diſpoſition of the Court of St. James's, towards the French Conſtitution, was believed all over Europe, and never even queſtioned in England. The French knew and avowed it; but they relied on the love of Liberty inherent in Engliſhmen, for defeating the deſigns of Government againſt their Freedom: And for a while, this notion of a difference of ſentiment, between the King's Miniſters and the people, ſeemed to be juſtly founded.

Mr. Burke, denounced the French Revolution previous to the abolition of titles, and before ſo much blood had been ſhed as lately was ſpilt in Briſtol, about the payment of a half-penny. He has continued his furious Anathemas, and long before the 10th of Auguſt, was feaſted at the cabinet dinners of our Miniſters, and careſſed by that Monarch, whom he had declared the Almighty to have hurled from his Throne, whoſe houſhold expences he had curtailed, and whoſe diſpleaſure was well known, in conſequence, to have been incurred. What then was the cauſe of Mr. Burke becoming ſo great a favourite, excepting his abuſe of the French Revolution? Was this a ſymptom of our Government

Government being rather friendly than otherwiſe?

In the ſummer of 1791, when our Government knew that the German Princes were planning a War againſt France, did not a newſpaper, notoriouſly in the pay of certain perſons, high in office, teem with the moſt artful falſehoods and groſs calumnies, for the purpoſe of deterring the admirers of the French Revolution from celebrating that event on the 14th of July, or of producing a riot which might diſgrace the meeting? Did not a mob aſſemble round the Crown and Anchor Tavern, in London, which, thanks to their own diſcretion and good intentions, rather than to thoſe who attempted to dupe them into violence, diſperſed without doing any miſchief? Did not a ſimilar mob aſſemble in Birmingham, which committed the moſt horrid exceſſes for the honour of Church and King? Was not that mob inſtigated by perſons, who ſuppoſed they were pleaſing and ſerving the Government, and do they not yet remain unpuniſhed? But from theſe events, can any thing be diſcovered in the conduct of our cabinet that ſhewed it to be "rather friend-"ly to the French Revolution than other-"wiſe?" A politician, would have formed his opinion of the ſentiments of our Government from the contents of ſuch a newſpaper, becauſe, it would not dare to take a ſide on a queſtion of ſuch magnitude and continuance, *againſt* the will of its patrons; and, through its channel, Adminiſtration might inculcate ſuch doctrines as it might be impolitic to avow. In ſuch a newſpaper, they ſpeak in the dark; they aſſert what

what they pleaſe, without being reſponſible, or known, or even perhaps, ſuſpected. The public look for the printer's name at the bottom, to ſee who is the author of the contents, when, probably, it would be more juſt to look to the vicinity of Whitehall.

Mr. Pitt himſelf, in the debate on Mr. Grey's notice of his motion for a Parliamentary Reform, three months before the 10th of Auguſt, called the French Conſtitution, ſuch, as if formed in the morning, could not exiſt till noon. He alſo reprobated the wild French theories, which, he ſaid, were ſubverſive of all order and government; and although he did not preach War againſt France, yet he countenanced thoſe who did, and condemned as dangerous every principle of the Revolution: Nor did any member of Adminiſtration ever hint that they diſapproved of Mr. Burke's war-whoop.

Was the conduct of our Miniſters in declining to negociate between France and Auſtria, in favour of Peace, when ſolicited to that effect by the former, no proof that they wiſhed to ſee a War? Was the balance of power in danger by the Empreſs of Ruſſia's retaining poſſeſſion of Oczakow, and in no danger by the combined armies gaining poſſeſſion of Paris, for ſuch was then the expectation? Could we go to War about a ſingle remote town, and yet refuſe to negociate, when the exiſtence of a great neighbouring nation was in queſtion? "But "we had no right to interfere, unleſs called "upon by all the parties *."—No! Then we

* Vide Lord Grenville's note to Monſ. Chauevlin.

have no right to interfere in behalf of Poland, unleſs called upon by the Empreſs of Ruſſia; then, we had no right to interfere about Oczakow, in behalf of the Turks, becauſe, the ſame gracious Dame did not call upon us; and we have no right now to interfere in behalf of the French Royaliſts, becauſe, the Republicans do not call upon us? We had a right;—it was our duty. We might have preſerved a limited Monarchy in France, averted the dreadful calamities of the preſent War, and ſaved an amiable unfortunate King from the ſcaffold.

Another pointed inſtance of the ſecret hoſtility of our Government, towards the new Conſtitution of France, is to be found in the correſpondence which paſſed between Lord Grenville and Monſ. Chauevlin, in May, 1792. The latter, invariably ſtiles Louis the XVIth. "King "of the French," which was the title decreed by the National Aſſembly, and the former as invariably ſtiles him, "His moſt Chriſ-"tian Majeſty," which was the title during the Deſpotiſm. Thus, the Britiſh Government, three months before the 10th of Auguſt, fully manifeſted its unwillingneſs to acknowledge the new Conſtitution: It was manifeſted in the ſame manner, as was afterwards openly declared, on refuſing to acknowledge the Republic, in diſtinctions of names and forms; and betrayed a ſympathy, at leaſt, if not an actual connection, with the Duke of Brunſwick. If to this, we add the uncontradicted paſſage in the Declaration of the French Princes, on the 10th of September, 1791, wherein the King of France, is "aſſured that *every* power in Eu-

" rope," (among which, Britain muſt be included) " is favourable to the enterpriſe of the " Duke of Brunſwick," and the very warm reception, both at Court and by Miniſters, of that public plunderer, Calonne, it would be the height of folly to queſtion the regret of our Cabinet, at the fall of the old French Government, and the ardent deſire for its reſtoration.

In addition to theſe proofs, which exiſted previous to the 10th of Auguſt, of the unfriendly diſpoſition of the Britiſh Court to the French Revolution, others have occurred ſince that period, which illuſtrate and confirm my opinion of the ſecret hoſtility of our Miniſters, and fully contradict Mr. Young's aſſertion, that, " till then, our Government was rather friendly " than otherwiſe."

Mr. Pitt, declared, in the Houſe of Commons laſt winter, " That as a right hon. Gen- " tleman, (Mr. Fox) had rejoiced at the re- " treat of the Duke of Brunſwick, ſo he, on " his part, would ſay, he conſidered it as the " greateſt misfortune that could have befallen " mankind." Lord Auckland, in his Memorial to the States General, dated Jan. 25th. thus expreſſes himſelf, when ſpeaking of France, " It is not *quite four years* ſince certain *miſ-* " *creants*, aſſuming the name of Philoſophers, " have preſumed to think themſelves capable " of eſtabliſhing a new ſyſtem of civil ſociety." Lord Hood, in his firſt proclamation to the people of Toulon, not only has imitated Lord Auckland, in alluding to " the miſery which " for *four* years has afflicted France," but declared, " that it is for the *re-eſtabliſhment*

" *of*

"*of the French Monarchy*, that Britain has "armed." But, indeed, the late Proclamation of his Majeſty, ſets the fact beyond diſpute, that we are fighting to give a Government to France, and is therefore, ſtrong preſumptive proof of the hoſtile diſpoſition of our Court, previous to the 10th of Auguſt, and, combined with other circumſtances, fairly juſtifies us in concluding, that it was only the fear of diſcontent at home *, and the confidence that our exertions were unneceſſary, which prevented us from being more early engaged in the War.

Much proof cannot be required of the unfriendly diſpoſition of our Court after the 10th of Auguſt. Withdrawing our Ambaſſador, and refraining to ſend another, was an unequivocal demonſtration of diſpleaſure, and a ſure preſage of hoſtility. The ſcandalous and inceſſant abuſe of Monſ. Chauevlin, in a newſpaper, (the Sun) conducted by perſons connected with, and at the devotion of Adminiſtration, was ſurely ſome ground for ſuppoſing there were thoſe who wiſhed to drive him from this country, and thereby precipitate a War. The French, on the other hand, ſtrongly evinced their deſire to keep Peace with this country, by continuing Monſ. Chauevlin at our Court, after the Britiſh Ambaſſador was withdrawn from Paris: This was an inſtance of humiliation, which, even amidſt all their ſucceſſes, exultation, and pride,

* Mr. Burke, a few days before the declaration of War, ſaid, in the Houſe of Commons, that he only pardoned the Miniſters for their ſlowneſs in beginning the War, on account of the neceſſity of waiting till the public temper was inflamed to a ſufficient pitch to ſecond them effectually. For nearly four years he had been waiting for that fortunate period, which had at laſt arrived.

they ſubmitted to, in hopes of maintaining tranquillity: And among many others, equally unqueſtionable, may be enumerated, the refuſal of giving permiſſion to Dumourier, to enter Holland, who, in a council at Liege, on the 5th of December, affirmed, that he could eaſily march to Amſterdam, and deſtroy the Dutch Government, if he received orders for that purpoſe. The Executive Council, however, would not give him any ſuch orders, for fear of provoking a rupture with Britain; a conduct, which they, no doubt, ſoon repented, as they ſaw by the ſtoppage of corn, the alien bill, and the ſpeeches of Miniſters in Parliament, how unfounded was their expectation of continuing Peace: They ſaw, that the antipathy of the Britiſh Government to their Revolution, which had been manifeſted from the beginning, and had gradually increaſed and diſplayed itſelf, was at laſt, going to break out into open War. The King's death gave a plauſible pretext for diſmiſſing Chauvelin, and by provoking the indignation of Engliſhmen, prepared their feelings to plunge into a War of vengeance; for ſuch it certainly was on the part of the Britiſh people, even in its outſet.

With regard to the profeſſed grounds of commencing the War; the decree of fraternity, the opening the Scheldt, and the aggrandizement of France, they have all been ſo amply diſcuſſed, that it would be ſuperfluous in me to animadvert on them; and, as was often ſaid in Parliament, there can be little doubt that they might have been amicably ſettled, if a pacific diſpoſition had been manifeſted by our Miniſters,

Miniſters, and if they had entered into a proper negociation. They indeed, pretended, that the French had given in their ultimatum, but our Miniſters have ſhewn, that when it ſuited their purpoſe, they could conſider ultimatums only as preliminaries, for, in the late diſpute with Spain, they appeared as anxious to avoid, as, with France, they ſince appeared, eager to precipitate a rupture.

Such were the pretexts for commencing the War: Its * real grounds, the ſubſequent conduct of Miniſters, has fully illuſtrated; they have ſhewn that Mr. Young was right in ſaying, its object was to deſtroy a combination of Reformers. Thus, then, according to the late Earl of Chatham and Sir George Saville, the American War was begun in order to gratify the Corruption of the Houſe of Commons, and according to Mr. Young, the preſent War is to preſerve its rotten Conſtitution. Indeed, Mr. Young's opinion is confirmed by every circumſtance; for, was not the late alarm directed wholly againſt Reform? Was not the proclamation, in May 1792, produced in conſequence of the ſociety of the Friends of the People being inſtituted for the purpoſe of procuring a Reform? What could be the object of that proclamation, if it was not to excite an alarm againſt Reform? Did it not immediately divide the kingdom into Reformers and Anti-Reformers? Was it not the avowed determination of

* Mr. Bowles, one of the Crown and Anchor committee, in his "Real Grounds," publiſhed laſt winter, ſays, it is merely on our part a War of *Defence*, and that no country has a right to interfere in the internal concerns of another.

Govern-

Government to reſiſt Reform, and the dread, that in the conflict, the Conſtitution would be deſtroyed, that firſt founded the alarm? It was from the ſpeeches of thoſe in power, from proclamations, camps, and addreſſes, that the kingdom firſt began to think itſelf in danger. In the ſame manner as the popularity of the American War was planned in, and directed by the ſecret Cabinet, was the late alarm planned and directed by the tools of Government. Alarms have always been found uſeful to thoſe who profit by "extravagant Courts, ſelfiſh Miniſters, and corrupt Majorities." The alarm excited by the riots in 1780, deſtroyed all hopes of a Reform at that time; and the alarm at the concluſion of 1792, has again defeated, for the preſent, the ſame cauſe. Thus we find, that alarms will always be hatched, when Parliamentary Reform is likely to ſucceed, and yet, that the want of that Reform brought on the American War, the moſt ruinous this country ever ſaw, and has involved us in another, the conſequences of which cannot be calculated, although they threaten to be much more dreadful.

After a period was put to negociation, excepting ſome underhand intercourſe, which, it would appear, Miniſters entered into merely to give a colour to an affected deſire of Peace; after the diſmiſſal of Chauevlin, what was to expected?—War.—His diſmiſſal was an unequivocal mark of hoſtility on our part, for ſo ſuch a ſtep has always been conſidered by nations in ſimilar circumſtances. The office, then, of commencing the War was thrown upon the French, who, it was not to be ſuppoſed, amidſt their ſucceſs,

would

would betray a daſtardly fear, by declining it: It was not to be expected that they would then ſhrink from a rupture with a country, which ſhewed it would begin War as ſoon as it could with advantage, and which had cut off all chance of the continuance of Peace, by driving away the Ambaſſador. Yet Mr. Dundas had the aſſurance to declare, in the Houſe of Commons, that the War, on our part, was ſimply defenſive! A declaration, which he could only have been encouraged to make by the ready belief then given to whatever was ſaid in ſupport of Government. He might as juſtly have declared, that the ſeizure of Poland was ſimply defenſive on the part of Ruſſia and Pruſſia; and indeed, thoſe powers made that their pretext; they ſaid, they divided Poland in order to defend themſelves againſt Jacobiniſm!

War, however, being commenced, it is not ſo important at preſent to inveſtigate its original pretexts, as to enquire what are now its real objects, how long it is likely to continue, and what will probably be its termination and conſequences. Upon the firſt of theſe points, there are as various opinions as there are about religion: Some are for fighting to reſtore the ancient Monarchy, and exterminate the preſent popular principles; others, deſire the reſtoration of the Conſtitution, founded in 1789; a third party, ſupport the War in hopes of gaining territory; a fourth, wiſh the throat of every Frenchman may be cut; and a fifth, ſupport it, becauſe—they hate the French. Mr. Young, though not ſingular, differs ſomewhat from all of theſe; he ſupports the War, in hopes of deſtroying

ſtroying a combination of Reformers, and procuring Peace for the next fifty years.

To thoſe who would continue the War, in hopes of reſtoring the ancient Monarchy, which certainly cannot be done, without deſtroying the preſent popular principles, I ſhall obſerve, that a War againſt opinions never was ſucceſsful. Peruſe the hiſtories of the Wars againſt religious Opinions, againſt religious Reformers, againſt the Principles of Freedom in Holland, againſt the Principles of Freedom in America. Were any of theſe ſucceſsful, were any of the ſame kind ever ſucceſsful? No. In the third campaign, the cauſe of the Americans, ſeemed to be quite hopeleſs, twenty times more ſo than that of France now is, yet it ultimately triumphed. Are not the French the moſt powerful Nation in Europe? Have they not formerly, when leſs intereſted in the cauſe, contended againſt and repelled all Europe? Are they not now animated even to madneſs with hatred againſt Kings and Nobility? Does not every ſucceſs of the Combined Armies encreaſe the unanimity, and conſequently the ſtrength of France? If enthuſiaſm in La Vendee has ſo long reſiſted that power, which ſo lately threatened the conqueſt, and ſince, has ſucceſsfully withſtood all Europe; if in one department it has coped with the competitor of Germany, Italy, Britain, Spain, Holland, &c. what may it not be expected to do in eighty departments? We are led, indeed, to believe, that bribery will produce revolts, and divide the French; but this is the very ſame expectation which was held out during the American conteſt, and then much

more

more successfully practised than hitherto has been done in France. The same men are pursuing the same policy. But Hawkesbury, Dundas, Howe, Auckland, and Loughborough, may have no more reason for exultation than they had in 1780. Bribery may, indeed, do much mischief, and it is natural for those who believe it persuasive, to try its effects on others. But "extravagant Courts, selfish Ministers, "and corrupt Majorities," are not "inti- "mately interwoven" with French Freedom, and therefore cannot be expected to produce prosperity and happiness in that nation. They do not fight for the glory of a Court, or the folly or ambition of a Minister; every man thinks he fights for himself. Even the Toulonese, while surrendering their town, declared their firm attachment to the Constitution founded in 1789, and the restoration of that Constitution is certainly the furthest stretch from Republicanism to which the French people will consent to go. It therefore follows, that either the allies must relinquish their original views, or animate the French nation, as one man, to maintain the contest against them. And here I will appeal to Mr. Young's favourite "Practice" and "Events," and desire to know, if a War against a people, against so powerful a people as the French, has ever been successful?

To those who wish the restoration of a limited monarchy, of the Constitution founded in 1789, it cannot be necessary to say much to convince them of the hopelessness of their object. They are, indeed, the only reasonable class, and it is

therefore lamentable, that they ſhould have the leaſt proſpect of ſucceſs. It was that Conſtitution which Mr. Burke reviled, which Mr. Pitt condemned, and which, as I have already ſhewn, never was ſincerely approved by our Government. It is that Conſtitution which Lords Auckland and Hood attempted to hold up to deteſtation, when they mentioned the miſcreants, who, for *four* years, brought miſery on France. But what is more, it was againſt that Conſtitution, before it was even finiſhed, that the German Deſpots made War; and to acknowledge it, would be to acknowledge they had failed in their deſign, that they were defeated. If further proof is wanted, that the Conſtitution of 1789, and the preſent Government of France, are equally odious to the continental Deſpots, look into the priſon of La Fayette, who attempted to fix that Conſtitution, and to ſave and ſupport the King:—Roberſpierre or Hebert, if, in their power, could not be treated with more cruelty.—Nay, it is even vain to expect, that the allies deſign the reſtoration of the *genuine*, the *ancient French Government*! The States General was a part of the ancient Government, and it was the States General that brought about the Revolution, and framed the Conſtitution founded in 1789, and accepted by the King in 1791. The Convention at Pilnitz was formed againſt the States General, after it had given itſelf another name, indeed; and Lords Auckland and Hood have called them miſcreants, who have brought miſery on France. It was the States General which began the Revolution,

and,

and, according to the allies, began all the preſent miſchief. It cannot, therefore, be the reſtoration of the *ancient* Conſtitution which is intended, it can only be a crippled Deſpotiſm.

To thoſe who conſider the objects of the War, to be the acquiſition of territory, it may be obſerved, that all which we ſhall probably conquer and retain, will, by no means, compenſate for the expences incurred by the continuance of hoſtilities; and even acquiſition of territory, may be of no ſolid advantage, if we are to believe the ſpeeches and writings of the ſupporters of Government, who have inferred, from the national proſperity of the laſt ten years, that the loſs of America has been rather a benefit than an injury to Britain. To perſons who conſider conqueſt as the object of the preſent ſtruggle, I will not remark, on the infamy of making War for plunder, becauſe, with them, and the tyrants of the continent, ſuch a remark would be treated as a jeſt.

Thoſe perſons who would continue the War, merely becauſe they hate the French, and hope to cut their throats, I conſign over to the Crown and Anchor committee, hoping there are ſufficient humanity and religion, in that worthy body, to make them bluſh at their brutality, and tremble at their breach of the laws of God.

Mr. Young, is for continuing the War, to deſtroy a combination of Reformers, and give us fifty years Peace! This ſhews the depth of his penetration. I appeal to all the "Experiments," "Practice," and "Events," that he can produce, whether all Wars have not, inſtead of deſtroying, created Reformers. As

the people feel the weight of burthens, they begin to think of lightening them, and conſequently, the firſt thing they turn their thoughts to, is Reform. Was not this particularly the caſe of the American War? What produced ſuch a combination of Reformers in 1780, if it was not the expences of that conteſt, and the miſmanagement of the public purſe? The ſame effects, will reſult in time, from the preſent War. Every new tax will make Reformers of the claſs which is fixed on to pay it: And even Mr. Young himſelf, may again think a Reform deſirable, if the neceſſities of the State ſhould oblige Government to diſcontinue his ſalary, and encreaſe the land-tax.

If he could give any proof in ſupport of his aſſertion, that the preſent War will produce fifty years Peace, then indeed, however unjuſt it might be, there would be ſome policy in continuing it. But what reaſon have we to expect a Peace of fifty years? Whatever may be the fate of France, does the Hiſtory of Britain or of Europe juſtify ſuch an expectation? At the beginning of 1792, Mr. Pitt, aſſured us, of fifteen years peace; at the beginning of 1793, we found ourſelves plunged into a moſt expenſive and alarming War! Is Mr. Young a better prophet than Mr. Pitt? A little more than a year before the commencement of the preſent War, Mr. Pitt was deſirous of involving us in hoſtilities with Ruſſia, on account of her aggrandizement, and is not the ſame cauſe of quarrel likely to exiſt, in an encreaſed degree, whenever our diſpute with France ſhall conclude? Nay, as all the powers in Europe are only ſmothering

their

their old rooted animoſities, in order to join in a common cauſe, will they not quarrel in caſe of a failure in their preſent project, by blaming each other with the fault; or in caſe of ſucceſs, will they not quarrel about the ſpoil? If Auſtria does not gain ſomething conſiderable, either in France or elſewhere, can it be ſuppoſed ſhe will allow Ruſſia and Pruſſia quietly to retain what they have taken of Poland? In which ever point of view we look at the preſent attempt upon France, either of failure or ſucceſs, the reſult is more likely to leave the ſeeds of future Wars, than the proſpect of any former ſtruggle in Europe. The Empreſs of Ruſſia is perfectly well aware of this, therefore, ſhe allows the other powers to waſte themſelves, and reſerves her ſtrength till the day of reckoning ſhall arrive *.

But it would be endleſs to expoſe the folly and injuſtice of the general motives for continuing the preſent War: It is of moſt real importance to know, what Adminiſtration deſign by it: And here, if we are to be guided by their

* This cunning Princeſs had ſucceeded in perſuading the late King of Sweden, to take an active part in the preſent cruſade, and it is tolerably well known, that her deſign was to have ſeized his dominions, when he had ſo far exhauſted himſelf, as to be incapable of reſiſtance. This is the reaſon why Sweden and Denmark, now obſerve a ſtrict neutrality, and keep a watchful eye over her. The King of Pruſſia has been drawn into the ſame ſnare that was laid for the late King of Sweden, but it is generally believed, that the purſe of another power, as well as the aſſurances of the Empreſs, was, in the *very firſt inſtance*, employed to prevail on him. The conſciouſneſs of his own danger from the Empreſs, now makes him ſo unwilling to waſte his troops againſt France.

declarations,

declarations, it is but honeſt to confeſs total ignorance, for it would ſeem they do not know themſelves. But it is not from the unintelligible hypocritical memorials of Miniſters, that the deſigns of a Government are to be diſcovered, ſo much as from the general tenor of their conduct.

The Engliſh Court profeſſedly began the War, in conſequence of the decree of fraternity, the attempt to open the Scheldt, and the aggrandizement of France. When ſatisfaction on all theſe points was obtained, and France was ſo far humbled, that ſhe would have agreed to any reaſonable terms of accommodation, Mr. Fox, in the month of June, moved an Addreſs in favour of Peace, as the avowed cauſes of War no longer exiſted. To this, Mr. Pitt objected, on the ground, that, although certain points might be the occaſion of a War, yet in its conduct and events, there was no ſaying what objects might ariſe, which it might be prudent to obtain; that, therefore, though the original grounds of the War no longer exiſted, yet his Majeſty's Miniſters thought it would be proper to continue hoſtilities, in order to procure indemnity for the paſt, and ſecurity for the future. As to theſe two words *indemnity* and *ſecurity*, while it remains undefined, what indemnity and ſecurity are deſired, as is the caſe at preſent, they have no meaning at all, becauſe, they may be made to mean every thing, or any thing, or nothing: They may be interpreted juſt as the Miniſter pleaſes: He may deem a *promiſe* to pay a certain ſum, as was the caſe in the late diſpute with Spain, a ſufficient indemnity, and an aſſurance of faith, though no

more to be depended on than the faith of the Empreſs and King of Pruſſia, ſufficient ſecurity? Or he may deem nothing leſs than the complete conqueſt of France, to be ſufficient indemnity and ſecurity. To fight for theſe two objects, unleſs they are preciſely defined, is to fight on the moſt blind ſpeculation.

Fighting for new objects, that may ariſe in the conduct and events of a War, is nearly the ſame thing, as fighting for undefined indemnity and ſecurity; and in ſpeaking of the one, the other may always be underſtood to be implied. They are both equally the Miniſter's ſpeculations; for how can the people know when the Miniſter will think he has obtained ſufficient indemnity and ſecurity, or when he may think it proper to deſiſt from attempting new objects, that may ariſe in the conduct and events of a War? The preſent War was profeſſedly begun for certain ſpecified objects, but in its conduct and events, thoſe original objects being obtained, we are next to continue hoſtilities for undefined indemnity and ſecurity, and then we are to eſtabliſh Monarchy in France!—The conduct and events of the War may yet give riſe to new objects, and our wiſe Miniſters may think they have not indemnity and ſecurity, unleſs they not only eſtabliſh ſuch a government in France as may pleaſe them, but alſo ſeize ſome of her territory.—The conduct and events of the War may again give riſe to new objects, and indemnity and ſecurity may be thought to require, that we ſhould deſtroy the government we had juſt given to France, as the King of Pruſſia did that which he recently

guaranteed

guaranteed to Poland, and we may agree to divide the whole French territory among the allies.—Still, in the ſame manner, new objects ariſing, may carry us further, and it may be thought neceſſary, for indemnity and ſecurity, to obey the exhortations of ſome of our divines, and to exterminate the whole French people. —Nay, if ſucceſs attends us, why ſhould we ſtop ſhort with France? New objects may ariſe in the conduct and events of War, which may, according to Mr. Pitt's reaſoning, juſtify its continuance, in hopes of the conqueſt of the whole world!

But, although from their declarations, we cannot preciſely aſcertain what are the objects of Miniſters in the preſent War, we muſt conjecture from their conduct, that they are much beyond what it is thought prudent to avow. Why was our intention of giving a monarchical form of government to France concealed, till the ſurrender of Toulon? Had any new circumſtances occurred in France, which made it more neceſſary to interfere in her internal concerns, in Auguſt, when Lord Hood took poſſeſſion of that town, than in February, when the War was begun?—No. But in February, the people were not ripe for approving ſuch a project, therefore, it was concealed from them: Nor are they now ripe for approving, what in the conduct and events of this War it may be thought proper to attempt. The ultimate objects muſt be brought forward by degrees, otherwiſe they might, perhaps, ſtartle the nation.

Since

Since not only the Britiſh Government, but the allies in general, appear, by their inconſiſtent conduct, to conceal the true objects of the War; ſince, by taking Valenciennes for the Emperor, Toulon for Louis the XVIIth, and ſummoning Dunkirk to ſurrender to the King of Britain *, there appears to be ſomething of ſelfiſhneſs, under all the plauſible diſintereſted profeſſions of giving happineſs to France, how are we to ſolve this myſtery? How are we to be guided in ſearching for the truth? Are we not to judge both of men and governments, rather by their actions, than their profeſſions? If, under pretence of improving an eſtate, an attorney had taken poſſeſſion, and by dint of law had wrung it from the legal proprietor; if the ſame attorney were to offer himſelf to another man, who knew of this tranſaction, and to ſay to him, "your eſtate is much deranged; your "grounds are neglected, and your tenants idle, "diſſipated, and wicked; put your eſtate into "my hands for a ſhort time, I will make it "productive and beautiful, and your tenants "induſtrious, virtuous, and happy:—it will, "indeed, coſt me many thouſands of pounds,— "perhaps half my fortune; but I am reſolved "to do all for your benefit, though I owe you "no gratitude, and expect no return."—If a man who was known to have acted ſo treacherouſly in one inſtance were to attempt to

* The Prince of Saxe Cobourg's proclamations, in April laſt, in the firſt of which he engaged to reſtore the Conſtitution of 1789, and in the ſecond, recalled that promiſe, ſhould alſo here be recollected.

repeat his villany, would he be believed or truſted?—Would he not rather be kicked out of the houſe of him to whom he made the offer?—If, then, it is from the actions of the man that we form our notions of his character and deſigns, rather than from profeſſions which we know him moſt ſcandalouſly to have belied, why ſhall we not form our opinion of the character and deſigns of a Government in the ſame manner?—Have not Pruſſia and Ruſſia robbed Poland, under the pretence of giving her a good Government, and making her happy?—And are they not now holding out the ſame pretences to France, in hopes of getting poſſeſſion, and plundering in the ſame manner, that nation?—Has a ſingle power in Europe remonſtrated againſt the robbery of Poland, as it was their duty, and more particularly the duty of Britain, which affected to be alarmed at the ceſſion of Oczakow?—Is not ſilence, in this caſe, conſent? How then are we to gueſs at the objects of the preſent War againſt France, but by looking at what has been done in Poland, ſince the ſame powers are combined againſt the one, which actually robbed, or tacitly conſented to the robbery of the other?—which conſented to the diſmemberment of Poland, which had neither interfered in the internal concerns of other powers, nor infringed treaties, nor violated the rights of nations, nor aggrandized herſelf by conqueſt; whoſe new Conſtitution was approved by Mr. Burke, and the other gentlemen in this country, who were the moſt implacable enemies of French principles, and even ſanctioned by its

its neighbour, the King of Pruſſia, who afterwards made it the pretext for his robbery.

Such is the prelude to what, in common ſenſe, we muſt conclude, is deſigned to be acted in France. If bribery can produce treachery and civil commotion, which, ſeconded by external force,—if, in ſhort, by any means,—for the laws of nations and humanity are laughed at,—the allies can conquer France, they will treat it as they have done Poland, and diſmember it in ſuch a manner that it never may again lift its head among nations. They will give it ſome puppet for a monarch, and, under pretence of awing Jacobiniſm, will keep up a large ſtanding army, for which France will be obliged to pay. This done, the balance of power, for which we have ſquandered ſo many millions, will be compleatly annihilated; and if Ruſſia, Auſtria, and Pruſſia can agree about the diviſion of the ſpoil, they may divide all Europe among themſelves *. They may make a ſecond partition of France, as they lately have done of Poland;—they may do juſt as they pleaſe all over the continent of Chriſtian Europe, for there will be no power able to oppoſe them.—And even Britain will not long be ſuffered to retain her independence, when the navies of France, Spain, Holland, Sweden, and Ruſſia, can be turned againſt her;—nay, they will probably make her the moſt exemplary inſtance of their vengeance, becauſe ſhe has been the nurſe of thoſe principles, againſt which, in France, they are now making War.

* For a moſt excellent view of this ſubject, ſee the Letters of the Calm Obſerver.

Such, I believe, are the real objects of the preſent War; and, if the allies are ſucceſsful, they will, in due time, be unfolded; but whether defeat or triumph follows their arms, the ultimate conſequences muſt be equally pernicious to Britain. For, if their true objects are gained by the conqueſt of France, Holland and Britain will immediately be at their mercy, and we have ſeen in Poland what their mercy is: If, on the other hand, the allies fail, we ſhall be obliged to ſit down in diſgrace a few years hence; and the large additional burthens may provoke a diſappointed and aggrieved people not only to make Reforms, but dangerous innovations. In Lord Cornwallis's late peace, the preſerving of Seringapatam was juſtified on the policy of ſupporting the balance of power in India; but how much more ſtrongly does the ſame reaſoning apply to the preſervation of France? Shall our *gratitude* to Auſtria and Pruſſia induce us to ruin ourſelves?—A gratitude, which is by no means due to them, as it was not for Holland but for themſelves they fought. The wiſeſt policy for Britain, therefore, is to follow the example of the Empreſs of Ruſſia, and rather ſtrengthen than waſte herſelf, now ſhe has gained all ſhe deſired when entering into the conteſt. To ſuppoſe that Pruſſia, Auſtria, and Ruſſia deſign, by this War, to give happineſs to France, is ſo truly ridiculous, that it does not deſerve a ſerious comment;—read their own recent hiſtories.

The duration of the War, or the events that may take place during its continuance, it is vain to calculate. It was poſitively aſſerted

of

of the American War, at its commencement, that it would be finiſhed in one campaign; and laſt February, we were taught to expect the ſame thing of the rupture now exiſting. Wars of a nature like the preſent, though even of leſs importance, have, however, laſted to a period, which might excite ridicule if the ſame duration were predicted of the ſtruggle now making in France. Wars in former times have been continued in that nation forty years.—The War by which Holland was enabled at laſt to throw off the Spaniſh yoke laſted ſixty years, although Spain was then the moſt formidable and Holland the moſt inſignificant country in Europe. Mr. Young by predicting, that the preſent war will bring us fifty years peace, and that every year's War will bring ten years peace in its train, calculates its continuance at five years. On this point, he is much more honeſt than thoſe who have written on the ſame ſide, for they have, and always will, aſſure us, that another campaign will ſettle it; and they will hold this language, even after the experience of twenty years, ſhall have twenty times confuted them. It is impoſſible to calculate the duration of the War; but, while the allies make the ſubjection of France their object, it muſt wear the appearance of a long, bloody, cruel, expenſive, ruinous conteſt. It is not that the Duke of York takes Valenciennes, or Lord Hood, Toulon, or Lord Howe, Breſt and Bourdeaux, or the Prince of Saxe Cobourg, Rouen, Lyons, and Paris: The greateſt part of France, may be conquered by treachery and force; but will it long remain ſo? Can all the

powers

powers in Europe keep a ſtanding army, liable to imbibe the principles of Liberty, ſufficient to awe France into perpetual ſubjection? Will not the inhuman conduct of Pruſſians and Auſtrians, which has already ſhewn itſelf in Alſace and Lorraine, provoke frequent and formidable inſurrections? The example of this country ſhews, that where the principles of Liberty are ſown, force will rather nouriſh than deſtroy them, and as the principles of Liberty are firmly implanted in the breaſts of the French people, they never can be rooted out. Temporary calamity may diſguſt them at their Governors, but they never have been, nor never will be diſguſted at their principles. France may, indeed, be apparently overcome, and Peace eſtabliſhed; but a people, filled with high notions of Freedom, never will long ſubmit to Deſpotic ſway: Frequent Wars will occur, until at laſt, the conquerors will be exhauſted, and Liberty will triumph. Mr. Young infers, becauſe the Engliſh Republican Spirit in the laſt century ended in Deſpotiſm, that therefore, the Republican Spirit in France will end in Deſpotiſm alſo:—Deſpotiſm, may poſſibly, ſucceed the preſent Republic, and reign for a while as it did in England; but did not the ſame principles which brought Charles the Iſt. to the block, alſo expel James the IId. and bring about the Revolution of 1688? And will not the doctrines now ſown in France, ultimately ſettle ſome form of Government, whether Monarchical or Republican, founded on the principles of Liberty? But it is extremely improbable, that a great and powerful

nation

nation of Enthuſiaſts will be overcome, even by treachery and force. Their ſtrength muſt not be calculated by a narrow Court Policy; nor, becauſe Heſſians, Hanoverians, and Sardinians, will not fight without money, in what is deemed a common cauſe, muſt it be concluded, that Frenchmen are equally mercenary: There is a National Treaſury, more powerful than all the tax offices in Britain, in the breaſts of Frenchmen:—a love of Liberty. The American paper was lower than even that of France has been, yet America triumphed; and though their Government has excited our contempt and horror, yet it cannot be denied that the French troops have lately diſplayed energy, enterprize, and bravery, ſcarcely equalled, certainly never ſurpaſſed in the world. Whatever fond hopes may be formed of the next campaign, I fear they will prove illuſive, for our future ſucceſs is not to be calculated by the events of laſt ſummer. Another Dumourier, may not be found, to deſtroy the principal army, and leave the northern frontier unprotected: On the contrary, we have ſeen the ruinous effects of his treachery repaired, and the tide again turned againſt us: Nor will his treatment encourage further treachery, or the treatment of the Toulonese, encourage Royaliſm. It may even be ſeen in the ſlighting treatment of the Ex-Princes of France, that the Allies do not deſign to reſtore them to their former fortunes, but that they intend ſomething both againſt them, and the Nation at large, which, it is feared, thoſe noblemen will not agree to, and therefore, inſtead of being held up as conſpicuous leaders in what is profeſſed

to

to be principally their own cauſe, they are kept in the back ground, and treated with coldneſs.

The ſubjugation and partition of France, together with the eſtabliſhment of an impotent Deſpotiſm, being therefore, the evident objects.* of the continental Triumvirate, it may be uſeful to enquire whether Great-Britain will aſſiſt them to the full extent of their views; how ſhe can ſtop ſhort of them, and make Peace; whether, in any ſtage of the War our Government will be diſpoſed, of itſelf, to put a period to hoſtilities; whether, it will not be obliged to do ſo by the remonſtrances of the people; in what manner it can make Peace, and what may be the conſequences of being compelled to make it by the public.

The firſt of theſe enquiries need be but ſhort; it is but to read the Treaty with the King of Sardinia, wherein, it is agreed, to pay him 200,000l. per annum, during the *whole courſe of the War*, and the other Treaties with Ruſſia and Pruſſia, through which we guarantee the dominions of all the belligerent powers againſt the arms of France. By theſe Treaties, we perceive, that as long as the French poſſeſs a ſingle

* It has been ſaid, that the ceſſion of the ſtrong holds on the northern frontier of France, would ſatisfy the Allies, and I have little doubt, that they really would do ſo, for the preſent. It would indeed, be a ſmall ceſſion of territory, but, it would in fact, be a ceſſion of much more danger to this country, than, not only the ceſſion of Oczakow, but of all Turkey in Europe. If the Allies poſſeſſed that bulwark, they might not only confine the French, while they plundered Holland, Denmark, and Sweden, and as they have done Poland, but the whole of France would be laid open to their maurauding incurſions.

inch

inch of ground belonging to Auſtria, Sardinia, or any of the allies; or, as long as the King of Sardinia thinks proper to carry on the War, we are bound to carry it on alſo, which is ſimply, that while any of the allies continues hoſtilities, we are bound by Treaty to join them, and without a breach of faith, cannot ſtop ſhort, and deſert their cauſe. If to theſe Treaties, we add the conduct of our Ambaſſadors in Denmark, Sweden, Tuſcany, and Genoa, we may very reaſonably conclude, that the Britiſh Cabinet is not only embarked to the full extent of the views of the Princes on the Continent, but is one of the moſt zealous, and even furious of the allies; for our Government ſeems eager to ſurpaſs in violence all that has been done by other powers. Peace, therefore, originating in the Britiſh Cabinet, muſt be at a very great diſtance.

The next queſtion is, will the people patiently ſubmit to a long continuance of the diſtreſſes which are always brought on by War, and invariably encreaſed by its protraction? Will they quietly ſee their blood ſhed, and their enormous debts doubled, in a vain attempt to give a King to France, and to aggrandize, by the plunder of her territories, the ambitious Deſpots of the continent? The Hiſtory of the American War, ſhews, that national diſtreſs will certainly open the eyes of the people to the folly of Government; and the growing diſſatisfaction at the preſent War, ſhews, that a campaign or two more, will make it as unpopular as ever that of America was. It will daily become more manifeſt, that we can derive no benefit equal to

the riſk we run, and the actual loſs we muſt ſuſtain by the continuance of hoſtilities. I therefore think the people will, at ſome period, not very diſtant, perhaps, put an end to this War, as they did to that with America, by petitions and addreſſes. If then, in one, two, or three years, the people *demand* a peace, *it muſt be granted*. But how is it to be made?—By doing that which Government has ſo much reprobated, by negociating with, and acknowledging the French Republic. It has indeed, been ſaid, that Britain may withdraw her forces, and by ſome underhand means, procure a ſeceſſion of hoſtilities, which, until a regular Government is ſettled, will be equal to a formal Peace: But when the French find the maſs of the Engliſh people reſolved on a termination of hoſtilities, will they not inſiſt upon an avowed negociation with, and an acknowledgment of the Republic? When they find the Court of St. James's, unable longer to carry on the War, will not they inſiſt upon their own terms? And will not a humiliating compliance, as was the caſe with America, be the conſequence? It is with this War, as it is with Parliamentary Reform: At preſent, Peace and Reform, might be made with the greateſt advantage, in the ſame manner as a Peace with America, long after the commencement of that unfortunate conteſt, might have been made on beneficial terms. But obſtinacy has of late been the characteriſtic of our Government. After the firſt campaign with America, ſhe might have been reconciled to us; after the firſt campaign with France, we have it in our power amply to

obtain

obtain reparation for all which gave us offence. It is ridiculous to talk of the inhumanity of negociating with the preſent rulers of France, when we recollect, that we in 1777, negociated with, and made *dear Allies*, of the wild ſavages in America, and inſtigated them to make War upon the United States, which they did in the moſt horrible manner: it is ridiculous to talk of our dignity being inſulted by negociating with the rulers of France, when the ignominious treatment of the Repreſentative of our King, by the Ottoman Porte, is recollected *: it is ridiculous to ſay, we can have no ſecurity for the continuance of Peace, as the rulers of France may daily be ſupplanted, for, no Government in Europe, obſerves Peace longer than it is its intereſt to do ſo, and without expatiating on the late want of faith in Ruſſia, Pruſſia, &c. with regard to Poland, I will venture to affirm, what is certainly true, that every party which has governed France, during the laſt four years, and every party likely to ſucceed to the Government, would, has been, and will be deſirous, and even proud of keeping Peace with Britain. But of late, our Court has commonly perſiſted

* Before our Ambaſſador is introduced to the Grand Seignor, he is obliged to eat ſome food, which is given him in the Palace, and to put on a cloak, worth about 30l preſented to him at the ſame time. When he comes into the ſublime Preſence, he is held by the arms by two officers, who will not permit him to bow of his own accord, but who, laying their hands on his head, *force* him to bow. They then ſay to their Sovereign, "Here is a poor man. We found him "hungry, and we fed him; we found him naked, and we "cloathed him."—Where is the *dignity* of the King's Repreſentative on this occaſion?

to the laſt extremity; till the popular tide has riſen to ſuch a height that it was forced to unconditional ſubmiſſion. And, I fear, the preſent conteſt will be proſecuted, till Peace muſt be made on *any* terms, and then Mr. Burke, may do what he ridiculed in Lord North's Adminiſtration, towards the concluſion of the American War, and ſay to the French, "Now do have "a King*!"

The evident determination of the Government to proſecute the War, is not ſo dejecting a circumſtance, as the too general encouragement given, not only to panegyrics on the corruptions and defects of our Conſtitution, but to the moſt falſe accuſations, and the moſt ſhameful calumny againſt thoſe who deſire the reſtoration of tranquility. To petition for Peace, is deemed ſedition; to contend in Parliament for Peace, is deemed treaſon, for what elſe can we conclude, from the abuſe thrown on the Glaſgow petition, and the inſinuations of Mr. Powis†, reſpecting Mr. Fox. The many wicked aſperſions thrown on the character and conduct of the latter of thoſe gentlemen, may, however, be juſtly conſtrued into eulogiums on his public

* This, indeed, has already been ſaid in Mr. Pitt's late extraordinary Manifeſto.

† This gentleman, in the Houſe of Commons, after beſtowing many eulogiums on Mr. Fox, ſaid, though he was perfectly convinced of the Right Hon. Gentleman's integrity, yet his conduct in that Houſe, was exactly ſuch as an advocate of the French Convention would purſue. This, out of doors, was turned into a downright aſſertion as a fact, and Mr. F. was even repreſented in the print ſhops, as the advocate of the French, with a brief and a fee in his hand.



virtue;

virtue; for, if ever there was a man, who conſcious of acting with rectitude, maintained the true intereſts of his country with firmneſs, conſiſtency, and moderation, againſt all that could deject and terrify, he is the man: If ever private intereſt and public fame; if ever the ſweets of ſocial life, and the proſpects of ſtate elevation, were ſacrificed to the national welfare, and to the liberties and happineſs of mankind, they were ſacrificed by Mr. Fox, laſt winter. He ſtood forward, almoſt alone, and with gigantic power, arreſted the Government in its wanton intoxicated career. Sedition and inſurrection had been declared to exiſt; the Attorney-General's table was ſaid to be loaded with hundreds of indictments, and thouſands were recorded as diſaffected perſons, upon the authority of anonymous letters*, and the veracity of common informers. The ſuſpenſion of the Habeas Corpus Act was announced in the Houſe of Commons, and had it taken place, it is probable, that every man who preſumed to enquire into the propriety of the meaſures of Government, who praiſed Liberty in England, or who dared look cheerful when events occurred favourable to it in other countries, would have been dragged to a dungeon. But Mr. Fox, ſtood forward with truth and energy. The Government was awed:—It pauſed:—and, finding the proofs of inſurrection and ſedition vague and trifling, it refrained from meaſures, which, the deluſion of the people might then, indeed, have

* This was done by Mr. Reeves. See Mr. Law's letter on his ſeceſſion, from the Crown and Anchor Committee.

applauded,

applauded, but which their ſober reaſon, at an after period, muſt have condemned and execrated. He undauntedly ſtruggled to avert the calamities of War; he did not ſucceed: But he ſucceeded in what was of much more immediate importance perhaps, in ſhielding the remaining Liberties of the Engliſh people.

His enemies have alledged motives for his conduct, not only baſe, but incredible. The Tory Jacobins, have accuſed him of being the hired advocate of France; the Revolutionary Jacobins, with being ſpurred on only by a ſelfiſh ambition, and the moderate, honeſt alarmiſts, though agreeing with neither of theſe, were not inclined to attribute virtuous motives to a man, who not only differed from them in political ſentiment, but whoſe character they found equally beſpattered by the extremes of both parties.

The accuſation of the Tory Jacobins, is evidently ſo unfounded, that it is unneceſſary to waſte time in refuting it. The ruling Powers of France have changed ſo often, that ſuch a thing, had it exiſted, muſt long ago have been diſcovered. Nay, one of the charges againſt the Briſſot party, made by the party of the Mountain, is, that they too precipitately involved France in a War with Britain; and even the ſupporters of the War at home, affirm, it was unprovoked on our part, and that the French were anxious to commence it. Briſſot's, was the ruling party laſt winter, and if it was true, that they were eager for hoſtilities, is it probable, they would bribe any man to prevent them?

them? Nor could the detraction of the ruling men * in the Convention, at the moment the rupture was made, be conſtrued, as a proof, that Mr. Fox was connected with them. But, laſt winter, paſſion had ſo blinded the moſt alarmed of the alarmiſts, that the moſt palpably unfounded aſſertion, if agreeing with their wiſhes, received the moſt implicit credit: For, "there are ſeaſons of believing, as well as diſ-"believing: And, believing was then ſo much "in ſeaſon, that improbabilities, or incon-"ſiſtencies, were little conſidered. Nor was "it ſafe ſo much as to make reflections on "them. That was called, the *blaſting of the* "*plot*, and diſparaging the King's evidence †."

The conduct of many parliamentary men gives ſome colour of truth to the charge of the Revolutionary Jacobins. It is an incontrovertible fact, that oppoſition to Government, has too often ariſen only in the hope of gratifying a perſonal ambition; but it is alſo a fact, ſtill more incontrovertible, and a fair examination of circumſtances, will clearly ſhew, that Mr. Fox, laſt winter, could not be actuated by any motives of that nature; but, that on the contrary, his conduct was the very laſt which would have been purſued, either by an avaricious, or by an ambitious man: For, if his prime object had been a place, or a penſion, there never was a more favourable opportunity

* See Kerſaint's Report, wherein Mr. Fox, is much more calumniated, than Mr. Pitt.

† See Biſhop Burnet's account of the Alarmiſts, at the time of the pretended Popiſh Plot, in his Hiſtory of his own Times. Vol. I. P. 448.

for

for gaining it. To oppoſe Government was then generally deteſtable, almoſt dangerous: to deſert principles and parties, and coaleſce with Adminiſtration, was deemed by the country, the height of public virtue. It was honourable in the extreme, for Whigs and Tories to embrace and co-operate: Conſiſtency of conduct became a crime, and apoſtacy the pureſt patriotiſm. The people conſidered it Mr. Fox's duty to join the Court party; his acceptance of an official ſituation, and thereby gratifying avarice, and even ambition would have received the warm applauſe and gratitude of his countrymen, as a ſacrifice of party views and perſonal antipathies, to what they believed the national welfare.

Such were the temptations to induce Mr. Fox to follow his own private intereſt, and indulge his ambition. If, on the other hand, we view the reaſons he had to *deter* him from ſupporting Peace and Reform, we ſhall find them not only inconſiſtent with avarice and ambition; not only that he was to forego all hopes of ſharing the honours and emoluments of office; not only that he was to incur the reſentment and odium of the nation, and be branded as the leader of ſedition, on the one ſide, and accuſed of puſillanimity and inſincerity, by thoſe, among whom he was claſſed, on the other; but his deareſt friends, and moſt valuable connections, were to deſert and revile him with a malignity, and injuſtice, which his oldeſt enemies never could arrive at. Of about two hundred coadjutors in the Houſe of Commons, ſcarce fifty adhered

adhered to him;—of about one hundred in the Houſe of Peers, there remained not more than ſix!—Inſtead of being courted and adored, to be ſhunned and calumniated, by an hoſt of men of the greateſt fortunes and talents in the kingdom, was ſurely no encouragement either to avarice, or ambition. To have all claſſes, to have Tories and Whigs, to have thoſe who are called Jacobins, and thoſe who were called Friends, join in the outcry againſt him; to loſe both popularity and court favour, and even the the enjoyments of private ſociety; to encounter at once, the frowns of the throne, and the indignation of the people, required courage, independence and abilities rarely to be met with. The undaunted, diſintereſted exertions of Mr. Fox laſt winter, in favour of Freedom, expiate all his former errors. Indeed, a recollection of circumſtances gives reaſon to hope he never will again be betrayed into ſuch errors as thoſe which ſome years ago rendered him moſt unpopular. For if we may believe report, the moſt odious of thoſe meaſures were prompted and executed by perſons who have ſince betrayed and deſerted him. The coalition in 1783 was projected by a noble deſerter, now at the head of the law department, and the negociation was carried on, and the meaſure enforced by him and his train of alarmiſts. The Eaſt-India bill, which begot the *charter alarmiſts*, and at once puſhed Mr. Fox from power and popularity, was the production of Mr. Burke, whoſe meaſures Mr. Fox found it always more eaſy to ſupport in public, than oppoſe in private. To the dog-

matick opinions of that gentleman, therefore, the miſtakes of Mr. Fox are greatly, if not wholly, to be attributed, and ſo well aware is Mr. Pitt, of Mr. Burke's unruly temper, that it is not probable, he ever will conſent to his admiſſion into the cabinet. If to the coalition and the India bill, is added, the ſupport Mr. Fox gave to certain great perſonages, who have alſo deſerted him, then, all that has made him unpopular, may be ſummoned up. It is his perſonal attachments that have injured his public character, and we now find thoſe for whom he has made ſo important a ſacrifice, eagerly aggravating the approbrium which originated in a reſpect for their opinions, and a zeal for their ſervice. But their conduct may prove fortunate for his reputation. Unincumbered by their baneful influence, and following the dictates of his own reaſon, his integrity and wiſdom, muſt ultimately be acknowledged; and though he may ever remain unrewarded with either place or popularity, the purity of his views, and the prudence of his councils, may yet ſave this infatuated country.

It would be endleſs to enumerate the libels that have been, and daily are, publiſhed againſt him. Mr. Young's book contains one of the moſt fallacious and wicked; and it may ſerve as an epitome of the others. In the debate on Parliamentary Reform, on the 7th of laſt May, Mr. Fox ſaid, "*If* the King and the Houſe "of Lords were unneceſſary and uſeleſs branches "of the Conſtitution, let them be diſmiſſed "and aboliſhed; for the people were not made

"for

" for them, but they for the people *. If, on " the contrary, the King and the Houſe of " Lords were felt and believed by the people, " *as he was confident they were*, to be not " only uſeful, but *eſſential parts* of the Con- " ſtitution, a Houſe of Commons, freely choſen " by, and ſpeaking the ſentiments of the " people, would cheriſh and protect both " within the bounds which the Conſtitution " had aſſigned them †." Mr. Young artfully drops the hypotheſis, and throughout ſeveral pages, accuſes Mr. Fox with recommending the diſmiſſal of the King, and abolition of the Houſe of Lords!—He omits the context, wherein Mr. Fox ſays, he is confident the people *feel* and *believe* the King and the Houſe of Lords to be *uſeful* and *eſſential* parts of the Conſtitution, and that a Houſe of Commons, freely choſen, and ſpeaking the ſentiments of the people, would *cheriſh and protect them*. Could there be a greater tribute of reſpect and approbation of thoſe two branches of the Conſtitution than was paid by Mr. Fox, in declaring the people love and will protect them?—Could there be a more groſs miſrepreſentation and flagitious calumny than the aſſertion of Mr. Young?

* Mr. Young, in a note on this paſſage, ſays, the Nobility and the King made the people, and that therefore the people were made for them! Upon his own mode of arguing it may, however, be proved, that the King was made for the people; for did not the people make the Brunſwick the Royal Family of this country? Mr. Young, I ſuppoſe, would have the Engliſh people made *for* the King, as the Heſſians are made for the Prince of Heſſe:—to be ſold.

† See Debrett's Debates.

Deſpiſing the thouſands of atrocious libels, and regardleſs of his own intereſt, ſtill we ſee Mr. Fox, unſubdued by menace or allurement, perſevering with intrepidity and moderation, in ſupport of the Peace, Liberties, and Happineſs of his country. But whatever conſolation may be found in his conduct, the general view of public affairs is full of dejection and alarm. On the continent, the laws and rights of nations are trampled on with impunity, without remonſtrance, and an extenſive dangerous ſyſtem of robbery is eſtabliſhed. The balance of power is loſt,—almoſt forgotten; and whether a Republic is attempted in France, or a limited Monarchy, like our own, in Poland, the fact of deſiring Liberty, *in any degree*, is ſo offenſive to the Combination of Deſpots, that they inſtantly take arms againſt it;—they deem a wiſh for Freedom ſufficient to juſtify all ſorts of maſſacre, devaſtation, and plunder. There appears to be no medium;—no hope of compromiſe can at preſent be entertained. An univerſal War is kindled, which threatens the complete annihilation of Liberty on the one ſide, or the total deſtruction of all eſtabliſhed Governments on the other; for ſuch appear to be the views of the two parties, accordingly as the ſcale of ſucceſs inclines in their favour. A permanent and equitable Peace, therefore, can only be expected, after a long, equal conteſt, ſhall have deſtroyed the means of further warfare; after both parties, in point of conqueſt, ſhall find themſelves juſt where they began, but mutually weakened by bloodſhed

and

and expence; after they ſhall have exhauſted themſelves into tranquility.

At home the proſpect is not leſs full of dejection and alarm than on the continent. In Ireland, a moſt extraordinary bill has paſſed, to prevent the people from expreſſing their wiſhes: —In Scotland, the moſt *unprecedented* puniſhments have been inflicted on thoſe who have adviſed a peaceable and conſtitutional Reform of Parliament. Theſe new and alarming experiments have been ſucceſsfully made in the extremities of the Empire, and it would appear that force is preparing, in order to inſure their reception, in the interior. Barracks are erecting in every part of England, where a ſtanding army is to be kept, inſulated from the people; and if that is found inſufficient for the purpoſes of Government, foreign Mercenaries may, by treaty, be landed * to overawe and ſecure ſubmiſſion. Our Conſtitution ſo much boaſted for its bleſſings, and its excellence, is libelled with impunity, as corrupt and ugly, by thoſe who ſupport the Government, and the libellers are rewarded with places and penſions for ſaying, that "extravagant Courts, ſelfiſh Miniſters, "and corrupt Majorities," are intimately interwoven with the practical freedom of Britain, and *are good*, while thoſe who affirm they do exiſt and *are bad*, are puniſhed with the pillory,

* The 7th article of the late Heſſian Treaty ſets forth, that "If it ſhould happen, they" (the Landgrave's Troops) "ſhall be employed in Great Britain or Ireland, as ſoon "as the notification, in ſuch caſe, ſhall be made to the "Serene Landgrave, they ſhall be put on the ſame footing, "in every reſpect, as the national Britiſh Troops."

not

not for ſaying they are bad, but for ſaying they do exiſt. To call the Conſtitution *pure* * has become a crime ;—to call it *corrupt* recommends to miniſterial favour. Mr. Young ſays " its ſpirit and principles admit of torturing " at pleaſure" (p. 199) and I fear it is at preſent juſt what the Government chooſes to make it, —juſt what the people will bear. The Freedom of the Preſs is deſtroyed by aſſociators † for its defence ; the ſacredneſs of the pulpit is brutally attacked by pretended combatants for religion‡; all confidence in public men has received a mortal blow by thoſe who have called moſt loudly for confidence §, and the profeſſed champions of the Conſtitution are the moſt buſy in " knocking it down." Petitions are treated with contempt ; petitioners ſtigmatized as traitors, and the vague charge of ſedition, has put a ſeal on mens lips. We are to be brought back to darkneſs and barbariſm ||

* See Mr. Young's remarks on the petition of the Friends of the People.

† Mr. Reeves, while he charges publicans to beware of taking in what he calls ſeditious newſpapers, &c. ſays, he wiſhes to ſupport the true Liberty of the Preſs !

‡ See the account of the treatment of the Rev. V. Knox by the Militia Officers who have taken up arms againſt the *Atheiſts* of France.

§ By the apoſtate in the cauſe of Parliamentary Reform.—Mr. Pitt.

|| Mr. Young not only recommends the abolition of Sunday Schools, and the Liberty of the Preſs, but ſays, the poor ſhould not be taught to read, leſt they ſhould read ſuch dangerous books as Mr. Paine's !—I wonder he did not alſo recommend the cutting out of men's tongues, leſt they ſhould ſpeak ſeditious words. Without tongues they would be equally, perhaps more ſerviceable as ſlaves; as hewers of wood and drawers of water.

as

as the only ſtate in which we can be happy, for knowledge in the poor, is found dangerous to the State, and ignorance and intolerance its beſt ſecurity. There are but two meaſures neceſſary to accompliſh all this: Firſt, eſtabliſh a ſtanding force, ſufficient to intimidate or puniſh the refractory;—Secondly, ſuppreſs the Freedom of Speech, and of the Preſs.

But all exhortations in favour of Freedom, are ſo generally conſidered, at preſent, as wild and deluſive theories, that it may not be improper to call in the aſſiſtance of Mr. Young's "Experiment," "Practice," and "Events," to ſhew what have been the conſequences of times ſimilar to the preſent. I ſhall leave the reader to judge from the following extracts from the ſecond vol. of Rapin's Hiſtory of England, how far the concluſion of the reign of Charles the IId. reſembled the preſent time. But I beg the compariſon may be underſtood as relating to the nation at large, and not as applying to his Majeſty. With ſome changes of words, but none of meaning, I think, the national temper in 1684, and in 1793, will be found to be ſtrongly alike.

"From this time, the King, during the reſt "of his life, governed not only without a Par-"liament, but with an abſolute power. When "he ſaw himſelf out of the reach of the Par-"liament, he entirely threw away the maſk of "diſſimulation, and ſhewed, that the Popiſh "Plot, the proſecution whereof he had lately "recommended ſo earneſtly to the Parliament, "appeared to him but a mere chimera, or at "leaſt, he did not think it near ſo dangerous as

"he

" he would have had it believed. It is neceſſary
" to unfold the cauſes of ſo ſurpriſing a Revo-
" lution. By the artifices of the Court, and
" the natural inclination of many Engliſhmen,
" the kingdom was divided into Whigs and
" Tories. This diviſion was ſo carefully fo-
" mented by the Court, and the Popiſh party,
" that at laſt it became very great. To render
" the two parties irreconcileable, it was inſinu-
" ated to the Epiſcopalians, of whom the ma-
" jority were Tories, that both Church and
" Monarchy were in danger, and that the ſcene
" of *forty-one* * was going to be revived. That
" the Preſbyterians †, under colour of providing
" for the preſervation of Liberty, really in-
" tended the deſtruction of the Church, and
" the introduction of Preſbyterianiſm ‡, in or-
" der to which, they were purſuing the ſame
" courſe they had taken in 1640, and the fol-
" lowing years, by undermining the founda-
" tions of Monarchy, for the more eaſy ſubver-
" ſion of the Church. Theſe inſinuations had
" the greater effect, as what had once hap-
" pened, and whereof, the memory was ſtill
" freſh, might happen again. The Epiſcopa-
" lians, terrified with the proſpect of falling
" into the ſame ſtate, from which they had
" been miraculouſly delivered, conſidered the

* " The ſcene of forty-one," the Commonwealth, terrified the nation then, in the ſame manner as the ſcene in France now does.

† For Preſbyterians may now always be underſtood Reformers.

‡ And introduction of Republicaniſm.

" introduction

" introduction of Popery *, with which they
" were alarmed, as a diſtant and uncertain evil,
" and the eſtabliſhment of Preſbyterianiſm †,
" as certain and preſent. It is even very pro-
" bable, that many whoſe paſſions were violent,
" looked upon Popery as the leſs evil. In this
" belief, they threw themſelves, as it were,
" deſperately into the Court Party (p. 723.)

" Addreſſes became ſo much in vogue, that
" the ſmalleſt Corporations feared the reſent-
" ment of the Court, if they neglected to ad-
" dreſs. The King received them all very gra-
" ciouſly, and diſtinguiſhed thoſe who brought
" them with particular marks of his favour.
" The Lord Mayor, Recorder, and ſome others
" of the City of London, waiting on him at
" Windſor, with one of a very contrary nature,
" were denied admittance, and ordered to at-
" tend the Council, at Hampton-Court, where
" they received a reprimand from the Lord
" Chancellor. It was pretended that theſe loyal
" addreſſes, as they were called, expreſſed the
" ſentiments of the people in general, though
" they came but from one of the parties. But
" what may make it preſumed that the King
" did not much depend upon the people, not-
" withſtanding theſe numerous Addreſſes,
" which weekly filled the Gazettes, is, that
" he never after dared to call a Parliament‡.
" If theſe Addreſſes had expreſſed the general
" ſenſe of the people, what could have hin-
" dered the King from calling a Parliament,

* For Popery may always be underſtood abſolute power.

† Republicaniſm.

‡ For calling a Parliament, it may here be underſtood, calling a *reformed* Parliament.

" which, to judge by theſe Addreſſes, muſt have
" been devoted to him.

" The King was not ſatisfied with diſcou-
" raging thoſe who would have preſented diſ-
" agreeable Addreſſes to him, but alſo ſilenced
" and impriſoned the news-writers, which were
" not of his party, while others had liberty to
" publiſh daily invectives againſt the Whigs and
" the late Parliament (p. 724.)

" Every man, who was not of the Court
" Party, and a furious Tory, was called a Preſ-
" byterian †. The Clergy, particularly diſtin-
" guiſhed themſelves, by ſhewing their attach-
" ment to the principles and maxims of the
" Court. The pulpits reſounded with the doc-
" trine of paſſive obedience and non-reſiſtance.
" The Clergy, ſeemed to make it their buſineſs
" to ſurrender to the King, all the Liberties
" and Privileges of the ſubject. According to
" the principles they preached, no Eaſtern
" Monarch was more abſolute than the King of
" England. This doctrine was ſupported in
" the Courts of Juſtice, by all the Judges and
" Lawyers, to the utmoſt of their power. All
" this was followed with numberleſs Petitions
" and Addreſſes. Any man's thinking of aſſo-
" ciating the ſubjects againſt the King, was ſuf-
" ficient, according to the current principles,
" to charge the whole Whig Party as guilty of
" the greateſt crime imaginable. Thus, the
" violent Tories, who then prevailed in the
" Corporations, were not ſatisfied with perſe-
" cuting the Preſbyterians, but alſo made the
" King an arbitrary and abſolute Monarch, as

† A Republican.

" if

" if there had been no other expedient to ſave
" the Church of England from the attempts of
" the Preſbyterians.

" Though ſupported by the Court and the
" Magiſtrates, the Tory Party had the advan-
" tage, the Whigs were not diſcouraged, in
" the expectation of cauſing ſome turns, by in-
" forming the people in pamphlets of their dan-
" ger. This did but exaſperate the patrons of
" paſſive obedience. They took occaſion from
" thence to carry the doctrine ſo high, *that*
" *when in the reign of James the IId. reſtric-*
" *tions became neceſſary, they knew not how*
" *to make them*, and many even perſiſted in
" ſupporting this doctrine, rather than own
" they had been in the wrong, to carry it to
" ſuch a height (p. 725.) In ſhort, a kind of
" infatuation ſeized the kingdom, and one
" Party, inſtead of coming to a temper, vio-
" lently embraced whatever was moſt contrary
" the other" (p. 726.)

The King having thus far ſucceeded, thought another alarm neceſſary, in order to terrify the people into a more full compliance with his deſign, and accordingly, the Rye-Houſe Plot was ſet on foot, by which, " the whole kingdom
" being ſtruck with terror, the King believed
" he ought to improve it to the eſtabliſhment
" of his abſolute power, ſo as to have nothing
" to fear from any future oppoſition. This was
" by depriving all the Corporations, and conſe-
" quently all his ſubjects, of their privileges. It
" was not proper to uſe abſolute power, but to
" proceed in a manner more politic and more
" dangerous to the people, by engaging them

" to make a voluntary ſurrender * of their char-
" ters, in order to receive ſuch new ones as the
" King ſhould pleaſe to grant. For this purpoſe,
" Courtiers and Emiſſaries were ſent to the
" more conſiderable Corporations to inſpire
" them with terror, and intimate to them, that
" ſcarce one could eſcape, ſhould the King ex-
" erciſe ſtrict juſtice. This chiefly concerned
" the Whigs and Non-Conformiſts, for the
" Tories were generally very readily blinded to
" obey the pleaſure of the Court. Jeffries, par-
" ticularly diſtinguiſhed himſelf in his northern
" circuit, at the ſummer aſſizes. He forgot
" nothing capable of terrifying the people, aſ-
" ſuring them, that a ſurrender of their charters
" was the only way to avert the miſchiefs which
" hung over their heads. Other Judges and
" Emiſſaries did the ſame, and at laſt, the larger
" Corporations being thus gained, the leſſer
" neceſſarily followed. So a ſudden and great
" change was ſeen in England, namely, the
" Engliſh nation, without Rights or Privileges,
" but ſuch as the King would vouchſafe to grant
" her; and what is more ſtrange, the Engliſh
" themſelves ſurrendered to Charles the IId.
" thoſe very Rights and Privileges, which they
" had defended with ſo much paſſion, or rather
" fury, againſt the attempts of Charles the Iſt.

" To make the people in ſome meaſure fully
" ſenſible of their new ſlavery, the King affected
" to muſter his forces, which, from one regi-
" ment of foot, and one troop of horſe guards,

* Mr. Young adviſes the people of England, to ſurrender almoſt every Liberty they poſſeſs.

" (raiſed

" (raiſed by himſelf, with the murmurs of " many of his ſubjects) were encreaſed to four " thouſand, compleatly trained and effective " men. It might then be ſeen, that the Mem- " bers of Parliament *, who oppoſed the raiſing, " or at leaſt the eſtabliſhment of theſe guards, " were not altogether in the wrong. But the " zeal of the Tory Party was now arrived to " ſuch a height, that they looked on every " thing which contributed to render the King " abſolute, as a ſure means to ruin the Whigs, " and conſequently as a triumph for them. " They prepoſterouſly imagined that the Court " only aimed at the deſtruction of that odious " Party, and was ſolely labouring for the " Tories" (p. 734.)

Such were the effects of the pretended plots, and the unfounded alarms in the reign of Charles the IId. They ſo ſucceſsfully induced the people to ſurrender their Liberties, that James the IId. was encouraged afterwards to attempt the eſtabliſhment of Deſpotiſm. A Revolution then became abſolutely neceſſary; and, thanks to the puſillanimity of that Prince, it was made without bloodſhed.

The baſe inſidious tools of Corruption are endeavouring to delude the nation into the ſame predicament in which it was in 1684. They have ſought for that which men moſt value, and they find it to be " PROPERTY." In order, therefore, to deter him from overthrowing the pernicious ſyſtem in which they fatten,

* Here let Mr. M. A. Taylor's oppoſition to the eſtabliſhment of Barracks be remembered.

they

they cry, "Reform will rob you of your Pro-"perty!"—But theſe are the deluſive, treacherous cries of the hyæna, and will betray ultimately into certain ruin. A Parliamentary Reform has been approved, at various periods, by a majority of men, both in Parliament and out of it, and even thoſe who never ſupported the meaſure, have, notwithſtanding, indirectly condemned the preſent conſtruction of the Houſe of Commons, or approved the principles on which a Reform is demanded*. When times of affliction and uneaſineſs occur, therefore, our defective Repreſentation will be deemed, and too juſtly, I fear, the cauſe of them. A Reform will then be made, not with caution, and a dread of going too far, as would be the caſe at preſent, but with indignation and vengeance. Moderate men will not be liſtened to. The moſt wild theoriſts will be entruſted with the work, and inſtead of a peaceful, ſalu-

* The king, in his ſpeeches to Parliament, after the American War, when Reform was ſo much agitated, expreſſed his deſire to ſupport the different branches of the Conſtitution, in their *due balance*:—to ſupport the *true ſpirit* of the Conſtitution, and to uſe his authority for the good of the people, for which purpoſe alone it was given to him. Theſe ſentiments, according to Mr. Young, are dangerous to the Government. And even Mr. Burke, about the period alluded to, ſaid, the King had gone ſo far as to recommend Reform from the Throne.

In addition to the above, Mr. Burke has called our Repreſentation the "ſlough of ſlavery:" Mr. Powis, in 1784, boaſted of aſſembling a little ſenate of independant Members round him, by which he implied, the majority were not independent. And the Dukes of Portland and Devonſhire, with many more Peers, ſigned a proteſt in 1777, againſt an increaſe of the civil liſt, becauſe it was reported, the money was employed in *corrupting* Parliament.

tary

tary Reform, we ſhall, probably, be involved in all the calamities which at preſent torture France.

Mr. Burke, not when he gloried in the eſtabliſhment of a *Republic* in America, but long after he began to reprobate the eſtabliſhment of a *limited Monarchy* in France, ſaid *, " Great diſcontents frequently ariſe in the beſt " conſtituted Governments, from cauſes which " no human wiſdom can foreſee, and no hu- " man power can prevent. They occur at " uncertain periods, but at periods, which " are not commonly far aſunder. Govern- " ments of all kinds are adminiſtered only by " men; and great miſtakes, tending to inflame " theſe diſcontents, may concur. The inde- " ciſion of thoſe who happen to rule at the " critical time, their ſupine neglect, or their " precipitate and ill-judged attention, may ag- " gravate the public misfortunes. In ſuch a " ſtate of things, the principles now only " ſown, will ſhoot out, and vegetate in full " luxuriance. In ſuch circumſtances, the " minds of the people become ſore and ul- " cerated. They are put out of humour with " all public men, and all public parties; they " are fatigued with their diſſentions; they are " irritated at their coalitions; they are made " eaſily to believe (what much pains are taken " to make them believe) that all Oppoſitions " are factious, and all Courtiers baſe and ſervile. " From their diſguſt at men, they are ſoon led " to quarrel with their frame of Government,

* See his appeal from the old to the new Whigs.

" which

" which they presume gives nourishment to
" the vices, real or supposed, of those who
" administer in it. Mistaking malignity for
" sagacity, they are soon led to cast off all
" hope from a good administration of affairs,
" and come to think, that all Reformation
" depends, not on a change of actors, but
" upon an alteration in the machinery."

Before the minds of men are sore and ulcerated, and the principles now sown, shoot out into full luxuriance, let us, therefore, give each part its proper force, and amend and renovate the machinery of the State, while there is no danger that in doing so it will tumble to pieces. War is the parent of Discontent, and Discontent is the nurse of Revolution. A continuance of hostilities will produce the times which Mr. Burke describes, and then, as in France, it will be too late to Reform. Instead, therefore, of wasting our blood and treasure to make a King of France, and to give felicity to that nation, let us seize this favourable opportunity to repair and invigorate our own Constitution; for the only means of promoting and insuring prosperity and happiness to Britain are a speedy Peace, and an effectual Parliamentary Reform.

FINIS.